

# THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW.

---

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1900.

---

## I.

### THE IDEA OF SACRIFICE AS DEVELOPED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.\*

BY F. A. GAST, D.D.

The subject I have been asked to discuss is one of interest as well as of importance. Worship is the main feature of the ancient religions, and sacrifice is the inmost center of worship. What is there in the idea of sacrifice to give it such extreme prominence? Why should sacrifice form that part of the ritual around which all other parts revolve and from which they derive their meaning? What conceptions did the ancients, especially

\* In order not to divert the attention of the reader from the text by constant reference in the margin to the sources I have used, a list is here given of the principal works to which to a greater or lesser extent I am indebted:—*Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 1877: *Der Begriff der Sühne im Alten Testament*, Doctor Eduard Riehlm; also a separate reprint with the same title. Riehlm, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*; Nowack, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Archæologie*, Zweiter Band, § 103 to 105; Smend, *Alttestamentliche Religions-Geschichte*; Smith's *Religion of the Semites*; Wellhausen, *History of Israel*, Chapter II.; Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Erster Band, Zweites Kapitel; Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, Zweiter Band, drittes Kapitel; Kuenen, *National Religions and Universal Religions*, Lectures II. and III.; Oehler, *Old Testament Theology*; Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, Chapter IV. I have only to add that after the address had been prepared and delivered, I received the *Expositor* for August, 1899, containing an able article entitled: *The Word "Atonc" in Extra-Ritual Literature*, by Prof. A. B. Davidson.

## 2 *The Idea of Sacrifice as Developed in the Old Testament.*

the Israelites, entertain of the nature, meaning and value of sacrifice?

All the writers of the New Testament except James and Jude refer in one way or another to the sacrifice of Christ, and draw a comparison between his sacrifice and the sacrifices prescribed by the Law. But these Legal sacrifices only represent the religious thought and life of the Exilic and post-Exilic age. They presuppose a long development extending over many centuries. If we are fully to understand them we must get the root idea and trace it through its various modifications until it reaches the elaborate, systematic form laid down in the Priests' Code.

Moreover Christian theology appeals to the Old Testament in confirmation of the doctrines it teaches. And rightly; for such is the internal organic connection between the Old Testament and the New that whatever religious teaching is found in the New has its roots already back in the Old. And whatever spiritual or ethical truth is found germinally in the Old, attains its full maturity in the New. Accordingly every theory of the atonement seeks proof of its validity in the Old Testament as well as in the New, especially in the sacrifices enjoined in the Levitical ritual. But before this can be done the idea of sacrifice in the stages of its Old Testament development must be rightly understood. We have no right to import a modern theory into the Old Testament text, and then from that text, so read through nineteenth century spectacles, deduce proof for the very theory we have put into the text. That would be a vicious circle.

What is the idea of Old Testament sacrifice? That question can be answered only by a true historical interpretation. We must not construe Old Testament sacrifice according to the thought of to-day, nor even according to the use made of it by the New Testament writers, who refer now to one kind of sacrifice and then to another, and now to one feature and then to another. We have to deal at this time with sacrifice in the Old Testament as a whole, not with any single part, however important, as, for example, the Priestly legislation.

Let me not be misunderstood. As regards my present purpose

I have no theory of the atonement either to advocate or to combat. My sole aim is to ascertain by objective historical exegesis what Old Testament sacrifice means, independently of the bearing of the results of such inquiry, whether favorable or unfavorable, on any of the current theories of to-day.

Now, important as this subject is, I do not hesitate to say that it is strangely misunderstood. There is, perhaps, no question connected with the theology of the Old Testament that stands in such urgent need of a careful reconsideration in the fuller light of modern literary criticism and historical interpretation.

What is the traditional conception of Old Testament sacrifice? It is something like this: Man is a sinner and has incurred the divine wrath. The justice of God requires that he should die. But God is not merely just, He is also merciful and gracious, and of His great goodness He has instituted a sacrificial system in virtue of which he can be true to Himself and at the same time pardon the sinner. The principle is that of vicarious punishment. An innocent life is surrendered that a guilty life may be spared. A blameless victim from the flock or the herd takes the place of the offender, and, being made to bear his guilt transferred to it by the imposition of his hand, suffers, in his stead and on his behalf, the death which he ought himself to have suffered. The flowing blood appeases the wrath of God and satisfies his justice, and so the sinner receives forgiveness and is restored to the divine favor.

Such, without exaggeration, is, I believe, the notion of Old Testament sacrifice popularly entertained. It contains indeed elements of truth, but, taken as a whole, it gives no accurate picture. It is not my purpose at this point to enter upon a detailed criticism of the view. All that I shall have to say hereafter will serve for its refutation. But a few critical remarks of a general character may be useful in preparing the way for the proposed discussion. In the first place, then, this view is altogether too narrow. It takes account only of the bloody sacrifices, leaving the unbloody quite out of consideration; whereas in early Israel both kinds of sacrifice embodied the same idea and possessed the

#### 4 *The Idea of Sacrifice as Developed in the Old Testament.*

same value. The material of sacrifice, whether animal or vegetable, was a thing of indifference. The unbloody served the same purpose as the bloody. But, secondly, of the bloody sacrifice this view gives a representation that does not hold good for all periods of the history of Israel. It evidently has in contemplation the animal sacrifices prescribed by the Priests' Code. But these have a meaning and aim widely different from the sacrifices recorded in the extra-ritual literature, and this difference, of which the traditional conception takes no notice, must be clearly discerned and carefully maintained, if we would be faithful to the historical reality. But, lastly, even of the prescribed legal sacrifices, the current view we are criticizing does not offer a correct interpretation. It borrows its main features from the picture of sacrifice as sketched in the Levitical ritual, but is not true to the picture as a whole. It finds the significance of sacrifice where it does not lie; it places all emphasis on the death of the victim, which after all is only of secondary importance; and it ascribes to certain sacrificial acts a meaning which they were not intended to convey; as, for example, that by the imposition of his hand on the head of the victim the offerer transfers to it his sins, in order that they may be expiated by the animal's death.

But perhaps you ask, how could a view so erroneous ever have arisen and held a place so long and so widely in the thoughts of men? That is easily explained. It is due to the fact that until modern times the several historical stages of Old Testament revelation were not clearly discerned and marked off and set in the right order of succession. Sacrifice, as laid down in the Ceremonial Law of the Pentateuch and embodying the theological ideas of the Exilic and the post-Exilic age, was taken as the type of all sacrifice; and to this type all other statements relating to sacrifice in the pre-Exilic age were made to conform as best they could. Testimonies belonging to times centuries apart were jumbled together as if they related to one and the same thing with one and the same meaning and purpose. The result could only be confusion. Moreover, in the past there has been too little really objective exegesis of the Bible, especially of the Old Testa-



ment. The interpreter too rarely sought to put himself in the position and amid the surroundings of the writer, so as to look, as it were, through his eyes. He came to the Bible with a ready-made dogmatic system in his mind, which he, for the most part unconsciously, read into the text. His exegetical results were already determined by his dogmatic presuppositions. It was not so much *exegesis*, as it was *eeseesis*. So we have just seen that the traditional view of sacrifice interprets the imposition of hands to mean the mechanical transfer of guilt from the offender to the sacrificial victim, of which there is not the slightest hint in the language. We shall meet other instances as we proceed.

How now can we arrive at the true idea of sacrifice as developed in the Old Testament? I answer: only by availing ourselves of the reasonably assured results of modern Biblical Criticism. What we need, first of all, is to arrange our documentary sources in their chronological order, or, if this be not in all cases possible, to group them according to the several periods to which they belong. This is one of the tasks which criticism has set itself and which, in the main, it has successfully accomplished. Ever since Astruc, almost a century and a half ago, attempted on the basis of the Divine names, especially *Elohim* and *Jahveh* to analyze the Book of Genesis into its original documents, many of the most acute minds have been working independently along the path he opened up, and along other paths since marked out, until to-day Old Testament critics are practically unanimous in maintaining that the Hexateuch is a compilation of four originally independent documents, now usually designated *J* = Jahvist, *E* = Elohist, *D* = the legislative portion of Deuteronomy, and *P* = Priests' Code. They are in substantial agreement in their several analyses of the Hexateuch. The only important question on which they are divided relates to the date of the document *P*, whether it is pre-Exilic or post-Exilic. A large and increasing majority of critics believe that it is post-Exilic, and I have no doubt of the correctness of that belief. In like manner other historical books—Judges, Samuel and Kings—have been resolved into earlier and later sources, the dates of which have been approximately determined.

Let us now arrange these sources in the order of time and study them with reference to the development of the idea of sacrifice. The Exile forms an epoch in the history. It is the end of the Old Israel and the beginning of the New. Let us first consider how sacrifice was regarded in the pre-Exilic period, especially before the age introduced by the great prophets of the eighth century.

### I. SACRIFICE IN OLD ISRAEL.

Sacrifice was not peculiar to Israel. In antiquity it was the universal mode of paying homage to the deity. According to our earliest historical source it was not of Mosaic origin. When Moses, before the Exodus, besought Pharaoh to let the people go a three days' journey into the wilderness, the reason he assigned was that they might sacrifice to Jahveh their God (Ex. 3 : 18), though the Priests' Code knows of no sacrifice before the giving of the Law at Mt. Sinai. Abraham as he journeyed through Canaan erected altars at Sichem (Gen. 12 : 6), at Bethel (12 : 8), at Hebron (Gen. 13 : 18), and elsewhere. Already after the Flood, Noah offered burnt-offerings to Jahveh (Gen. 8 : 20). Indeed, prior to the Exile, the origin of sacrifice was traced to the very beginning of the human race. Cain and Abel each brought an offering unto Jahveh (Gen. 4 : 3, 4).

The mode of sacrifice was not prescribed by a written law, but by ancient custom. Doubtless it was essentially the same wherever offerings were presented to a god, whether among the heathen or in Israel. You remember how Naaman, after he was healed of his leprosy by the prophet Elisha, declared : " Behold, now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel, and, thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto Jahveh " (2 Kg. 5 : 15, 17). He was accustomed to sacrifice to Rimmon, yet, without instruction, knew also how to sacrifice to Jahveh. The ritual was not the important thing. That, doubtless, varied according to circumstances. It might at one time be very simple, as when Saul commanded the people, who had sinned against Jahveh in eating with

the blood, to roll to him a great stone which he made an altar on which the blood could be poured (1 Samuel 14 : 33-35); and at another, it might be elaborate, as at the royal sanctuaries where, with an established priesthood and numerous rich offerings, there would naturally be a more splendid ceremonial. Do you ask, then, what constitutes a true and acceptable sacrifice in early Israel? I answer: it was not the manner in which, nor the place where, nor the time when, nor yet the person, or class of persons by whom it was offered. Its legitimacy lay in this, that, whatever the ritual, the offering was made to Jahveh.

The meaning of sacrifice is nowhere explained in the Old Testament. It needed not to be. The nature and purpose of sacrifice were well understood from immemorial usage. We may, however, learn much from names. Now the general term throughout the Old Testament for sacrifice as such, of whatever kind or material, is *minchāh*; except in the Priests' Code, in which *Korbān* is used in this comprehensive sense, and *minchāh* is always the technical designation of the cereal, or grain offering, the misleading "meat-offering" of the Authorized Version, and the much improved "meal-offering" of the Revised Version. In English, too, we need a term to express the general idea of "sacrifice," that is, of any oblation presented at the altar. "Offering" is too broad, as it may include much more than the offerings at the altar. No better term can, perhaps, be found than "sacrifice," though originally *sacrificium*, like its corresponding *hierourgia*, denoted "any action within the sphere of things sacred to the gods." But as the oblations at the altar were the beating heart of worship, the Greek and Latin terms were at a later time limited to them. In the Authorized Version the word "sacrifice" has been still further narrowed in meaning. *zebhaḥ uminchāh* is usually rendered "sacrifice and offering," thus restricting the meaning of the English word "sacrifice" to the bloody oblation, and of "offering" to the unbloody oblation. I shall employ the word "sacrifice" in its originally comprehensive sense as denoting any oblation, whether taken from the vegetable or the animal kingdom, presented at the altar.

Now the word *minchāh* (by which the general notion of sacrifice was expressed in early Israel) signifies a "gift," a "present." Sacrifice is, then, primarily *a gift to God*. Originally the word designated a present to an earthly king. When a loyal subject appeared before his ruler to obtain some help or express thanks for some favor, it was customary to bring with him a suitable gift. You will remember that when the children of Israel were oppressed by Eglon, king of Moab, they sent him a "present" by the hand of Ehud (Jud. 3 : 15, 17). When Saul had been proclaimed king, the children of Belial said, "How shall this man save us?" And they despised him and brought him no present, that is to say, paid him no tribute (1 Sam. 10 : 27). And so we are told that all the kingdoms from the river unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt served Solomon all the days of his life and brought him tribute (1 Kings 4 : 21 ; Heb. 5 : 1). By an easy transition from the earthly to the heavenly King, the word *minchāh* came to denote a gift paid to God. Already in the earliest legislation we read : "None shall appear before me empty"; or, more probably, with a slight change of vowel points ; "None shall see my face empty-handed" (Ex. 23 : 15 ; cf. Deut. 16 : 16 where the law is repeated).

It is understood, of course, that if the gift is to be acceptable, certain conditions are required. It must be the property of the giver ; for it would be an insult to God to offer Him what I have no right to give. It must possess some value, not necessarily much, but enough to involve a degree of self-denial. It must be presented at a fitting time, above all, not when the Deity is in an angry mood. If these conditions were observed, it mattered little in the early period whether the sacrifice was bloody or unbloody. Cain and Abel each offered a *minchāh* to Jahveh. Cain "brought of the fruit of the ground," Abel, "of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof." Abel's was accepted. but Cain's rejected ; not, however, because the former was a bloody offering, and the latter an unbloody offering. Each gave what he had to give. The one was a husbandman, the other a shepherd. Their gifts would have been of equal value if offered in the same spirit of piety.

Sacrifice, then, is a gift to God, and you will now observe that in early Israel, of which we are at this point speaking, it is always a *gift of food*. Does this seem to you strange? Remember that we have now to do with the beliefs and customs of a primitive age of little culture and with all the simplicity of childhood. The idea of God as it presents itself to us had not yet dawned upon the mind of the world—the idea, I mean, of the supreme Spirit, infinite and omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient Creator of this boundless universe and ruling in nature and history for moral ends. That idea was the gift of the prophets and psalmists of Israel, and in its highest form, of Christ and His apostles. The word *Elohim* conveyed a very different meaning to the old Hebrew mind from that which the word “*God*” conveys to ours. It was at once more comprehensive and lower.

*Elohim*, whatever its etymology, is as you are aware, a plural noun. It denoted originally an order of existence, the entire realm, in fact, of superhuman, supersensible, as we should say, spiritual beings of different ranks. The highest are the *gods*; and the word *elohim* is employed with reference either to the heathen deities, or, after monotheism became the established doctrine, to the one God of Israel.

It included, however, another and distinctly inferior class of beings, corresponding to our conception of angels, as spirits who minister to the superior *elohim*. Such were the *b'nē hā'elohim* “the sons of God,” who presented themselves before Jahveh with *hassātān*, “the adversary,” among them (Job 1:6). They were “sons of God,” as belonging to the class of *elohim-beings*, one of whom is distinguished as “the adversary,” yet of lower rank than Jahveh, who is supreme among the *elohim*, and to whom they report the occurrences on earth. And this is the meaning when it is said in Psalm VIII.: “Thou madest him a little lower than *elohim*.” Substitute “God,” in our sense of that word, for *elohim*, and the statement would be blasphemous; man, the finite creature, lacking little of equality with the infinite Creator! But understand by *elohim* an order of beings spiritual and supersensible, then it will be found true that man in



his higher nature already belongs to the *elohim*, yet in his present state stands a little lower, because his spirit through the body is still bound to earth.

And this leads me to remark that the *elohim* included the shades of the dead. You will remember that when Saul in his perplexity consulted the witch of Endor, he requested her to bring up Samuel. When she did so, Saul asked her: "What seest thou?" she replied, "I see *elohim* ascending out of the earth." That by *elohim* she meant Samuel's departed spirit is evident from her description: an old man covered with a mantle. And Saul at once perceived that it was Samuel (1 Sam. 28:11-14).

Among the *elohim* of highest rank Jahveh stands supreme, as the enthusiastic poet exclaims in the Song of Deliverance: Who is like unto thee, O Jahveh, among the *elohim* (Ex. 15:11). Jahveh is God of gods, indeed, but was not yet regarded as omnipresent, else he needed not to come down to see the city and the tower which the children of men were building (Gen. 11:5); nor yet as omniscient, else why should he, "walking in the garden in the cool of the day" while Adam and his wife were hiding themselves from his presence among the trees, call to Adam and ask: "Where art thou" (Gen. 3:8, 9); or why should he journey to Sodom and Gomorrah to inquire whether the report brought to him of the wickedness of those cities was true or not (Gen. 18:20, 21)? He is not only represented in human form, but also endowed with human passions. He repents that he has made man. His wrath is easily aroused, as is seen in the case of Uzzah, who, when the ark of God was in danger of falling from the shaking cart, put forth his hand to prevent such a misfortune. And with what reward? He was instantly struck dead for what Jahveh regarded as an unwarrantable familiarity in laying hold on the sacred ark (2 Sam. 6:6, 7). So God excites discord between Abimelech and the men of Shechem (Jud. 9:23); sends an evil spirit on Saul to trouble him (1 Sam. 16:14); puts a lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets of Israel that they may deceive Ahab and entice him to go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead (1 Kings 22:19-23);



and when his anger was kindled against Israel, incites David to number the people, and then punishes him for so doing (2 Sam. 24).

Ought it to surprise us, then, that a God so naïvely conceived of, should in that early period be supposed to have needs like man? If he take a pleasure-walk in the garden in the cool of the day (Gen. 3 : 9); if, as Jotham says (Jud. 9 : 13), wine "cheereth *elohim* and man," why should it seem a strange thing that he should accept a gift of food offered him by his worshippers? What indeed was the original meaning of the word *cultus*? *Colere*, from which it is derived, signifies to *bestow care upon a person or thing*. Agriculture is a caring for the fields. *Cultus*, in its religious sense, at first denoted a pious ministering to the needs of the *elohim*.

Perhaps you say, such crude ideas and absurd customs may have prevailed among the heathen; but surely in Israel, sacrifice could at no time have been regarded as a gift of food to God. To the later Israelites, indeed, such a gross materialistic conception seemed as senseless as it does to us. You will remember how strongly the writer of the Fiftieth Psalm protests against the thought that Jahveh eats the flesh of bulls and drinks the blood of goats. Yet such was unquestionably the thought entertained in the age before the great prophets and by the mass of the people even in the prophetic age. So deeply, indeed, had it become rooted in the mind of early Israel that the terms in which it finds expression are carried over, with a symbolical meaning into the ritual Law. Let us look at a few facts.

The altar is expressly called a *table*. "Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar: and ye say, wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible" (Mal. 1 : 7, 12). Ezekiel, after describing the altar adds: "This is the table that is before the Lord" (41 : 22). The same word *ārak*, to "set in order," is used with reference to placing food upon a table, or to arranging the sacrificial pieces upon the altar. Now a table is designed to be set with food and an altar would never have been called a table if the sacrifices placed on it had not originally been regarded as gifts of food for God. Of course

the prophets whom I have quoted no longer entertained this notion. But the fact that they employ sacrificial terms in a figurative sense implies an earlier time when these terms were taken seriously in their literal sense. When Gideon was visited by the angel of God he prepared a kid and unleavened cakes. Putting the flesh in a basket and the broth in a pot, he brought them to the angel, who said to him, "Take the flesh and the unleavened cakes, and lay them upon this rock and pour out the broth." When he had done so, the angel touched them with his staff; and there rose up fire out of the rock, and consumed the flesh and the cakes. That rock was at once altar and table, though designated by neither name.

Again that which came upon the altar is expressly called "the bread of God." Indeed Jahveh himself says: "My offering, even my food, in sacrifices made by fire, an odor of satisfaction unto me, shall ye observe to offer unto me in their due season" (Num. 28: 2). Such a designation of sacrifice could have its origin only in a time when what came upon the altar was regarded in some most real sense as food to be partaken of by God. And the expression, "odor of satisfaction" ("sweet savor," A. R.) could not have been at first, what later on it became, a mere figure of speech. It must have meant the odor of the ascending smoke of sacrifice, which when smelled afforded a pleasurable satisfaction. The language is strongly anthropomorphic, though hardly more so than other expressions employed in the early period.

In Deut. 32: 37, 38 Jahveh says in reference to the apostate Israelites, "Where are their gods, the rock in whom they sought refuge? They that ate the fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink-offerings." Here it is distinctly stated that the heathen gods consumed the sacrifices offered to them in the form of food and drink. Such was the universal belief outside Israel. Was the belief in the early period of Israel's history different?

Consider the materials employed in sacrifices. They were articles of food, and exclusively of human food. Such was the

case in early Israel; it continued to be the case in the New Israel in the sacrifices prescribed by the Law. The only exceptions are a few extraordinary sacrifices called forth by special occasions and recorded in the extra-ritual literature.

From the vegetable kingdom we have corn, wine and oil. *Bread* was the most common article of human diet. In the sacrificial service it was sometimes presented as an independent offering, as in the case of the shew-bread; at other times as an accompaniment of other offerings; generally unleavened (1 Sam. 1:24; Jud. 6:19), though also leavened, as was the thank-offering in the time of Amos (Am. 4:5). *Wine*, too, accompanied a meal, and no one thought of partaking of it before a libation had first been poured out to the Deity. Remember Jotham's word: Wine cheers *elohim* and man. *Oil* was used in preparing the meal. To some extent it took the place of butter with us. That it was at times an independent offering may be inferred from Mic. 6:6-8; "Wherewith shall I come before Jahveh, bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will Jahveh be pleased with thousands of rams, *with ten thousands of rivers of oil?*"

From the animal kingdom the sacrificial victims were taken from the flock and herd. Only the domesticated animals were employed; not game, which, as wild, was not regarded as the possession of man. The only exception, more apparent than real, was the turtle-dove, for this seems to have become domesticated. The blood and the fat were always reserved for Jahveh and in certain sacrifices, other portions besides.

And so Hannah, after she had weaned Samuel, went up to sacrifice to Jahveh the yearly sacrifice and took her child (not "with three bullocks," as in A. V.) but with a three year old bullock, an ephah of flour to be hastily baked into cakes, and a skin of wine. These were the materials of the sacrifice. They were unusually rich and abundant. Doubtless, it was expected that many besides the parents would eat and drink and rejoice before Jahveh.

14 *The Idea of Sacrifice as Developed in the Old Testament.*

And now consider, further, that the materials employed, vegetable and animal, were not presented in their natural state, but in a prepared form as for a repast. What was offered Jahveh was not wheat or barley, grapes, olives and raw flesh; but baked bread, wine expressed from the grape, oil beaten from the olives, flesh at first boiled, later roasted on the altar. Remember, all this is a *minchāh*, a gift, to Jahveh; and if it means not food for him, what can it mean?

Gross, however, as is this notion of food for *elohim* it was not thought even in early Israel that God eats the gross material substances, set before Him, with the mouth, after the manner of men. What was conveyed to Him was the "savor of satisfaction," the fragrance of the wine, the odor of the burning fat. But you may ask, could even the most ignorant mind entertain such an idea? Would it not be contradicted by the senses? Do not forget, if you please, the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. What is there in the sacrament of the Body and Blood? For the sense of sight, taste and smell, only bread and wine; but for the faith of many millions of Christians at the close of this nineteenth century, the real substance of the Body and Blood of Christ under the deceptive appearance of bread and wine. Is this belief of the transmutation of one substance into another, without change of external appearance to the sense, more rational—is it not less rational—than the belief of the early Israelite, that the superfine essence of the sacrificial materials was conveyed to God, while the grosser elements remained to be consumed by his worshippers?

Perhaps you ask, was all this food appropriated wholly to the Deity? No; and here we meet the highest meaning of sacrifice in early Israel. The sacrificial transaction usually culminated in a common meal which served the worshippers as a medium of communion with their God and with one another.

Prior to the Exile there were but two species of animal sacrifice: the burnt-offering, *olāh* and the peace offering, *shelem*, also *zebhach*, sometimes *zebhach shēlāmîm*. The burnt-offering was wholly consumed on the altar, but only part of the peace-offering

was burned, the remainder being devoted to a sacrificial feast of which the worshippers partook. In the early period the burnt-offering is rarely found alone. Perhaps it was presented independently only when the worshippers felt that, for some reason or other, it was not fitting that they should share in the offering, or when there were so many victims that it was deemed proper to reserve one wholly for God. However that may be, the burnt-offering is almost always associated with the peace-offering and the sacrificial meal. In primitive times when religion was social, rather than individual, sacrifice and feast were almost identical. At the annual festivals and on other occasions of general interest, the whole family or clan went up to the sanctuary to meet their God. In holiday attire, with music and song, they lead their victims with them and bear a store of bread and wine to make a complete repast. To this they invite their God; or, rather, He is the host and the worshippers are His guests; for the provisions of which all partake are the gift of His hand. Thus eating and drinking at the same table they have fellowship with one another and with their God. The significance of such a sacrificial meal it is difficult for us, with our occidental modes of thought and habits of life, fully to understand. Interpreted by the law of Semitic hospitality, it meant the union of God and His people in one common life, the pledge of His gracious favor and the assurance of His protection and care. The whole transaction bore in this way a sacramental character.

Such a view of sacrifice implies a religion of a joyous spirit. God and His people are bound together by a tie not easily sundered. They have confidence in each other, and generally stand in a friendly relation, like that of a father to his children. God may at times take offense, but his anger soon subsides. The worshipper is not troubled by a strong and deep feeling of moral wrong and a consequent anxious craving for divine forgiveness. Of the sense of sin and guilt as we know it, there is scarcely a trace in the early history of Israel. Sin was merely a violation of civil or ritual customs. The conception of morality was outward and mechanical, having little regard to the inner life.

With a low ethical standard and a weak sense of moral wrong there was little felt need of a rite to still the divine anger. The idea of appeasing God and turning away his wrath by sacrifice belongs to the heathen religions, and though adopted by apostate Israelites in the dreadful times of Manasseh and later kings, it was foreign to the genius of the religion of Israel. It is never found in the prophets. According to them, not sacrifice but repentance and reformation are the means of regaining the divine favor and reestablishing peaceful relations with God. Sacrifice was not offered while Jahveh was in the heat of anger.

## II. SACRIFICE IN THE NEW ISRAEL.

Such was sacrifice in the Old Israel. After the exile we find a New Israel widely different from the Old in its beliefs, its ideals, its aims, its hopes. Ethical monotheism has superseded the earlier crass conception of Elohim. It is no longer thought that by a natural necessity, God, His people and the land constitute a solidarity. The territorial idea has been eliminated. God is the one only God, the God of the whole world. Jahveh, indeed, holds a special relation to His chosen people, Israel; but it is a free, moral relation involving mutual obligations. Religion has lost much of the joyousness it had in the former time when the worshippers were the happy guests at Jahveh's table, eating, drinking and rejoicing in His presence. Now it has assumed a serious character, it has even a tinge of gloom; for the worshippers approach their God with a sense of sin unknown in early Israel—a sense which has been aroused by the earnest teachings of the prophets and the stern judgments of Jahveh. Once religion was spontaneous and unfettered, shedding gladness on the affairs of ordinary life. Harvest and vintage and sheep-shearing, the arrival of a welcome guest, the inauguration of a military campaign, the achievement of a glorious victory, afforded occasion for a sacrifice with its accompanying meal by partaking of which the bonds of friendship between the worshippers and their God were strengthened and hallowed. Now religion is strictly regulated by law. Its sphere is something apart from



the sphere of daily life. Worship can be performed only at the one central sanctuary at definite appointed times and by the observance of minutely prescribed rites. The naïve simplicity and freedom of a former age have given place to the rigidity and formality of an elaborate ceremonial. The easy familiarity with which the worshipper in early Israel drew near to his God has disappeared. Access to Jahveh has become more difficult. In His unique holiness He is unapproachable, except through priestly mediation.

The New Israel lives its life under conditions so changed as to amount almost to a complete break with its past. Time will not permit me to trace out the transition from the Old to the New. It must suffice to note in the briefest possible way a few of the salient points.

It was the prophets of Israel who lifted the popular religion out of its primitive naturalness to the plane of an ethical religion. Samuel, Nathan, Elijah, Elisha and others led the way by developing the germ of moral life which was inherent in this religion from the beginning and differentiated it from all other religions of the Semitic race. Their work was taken up and carried forward by the canonical prophets. To them it was given to discern and reveal the strictly ethical character of Jahveh as a God of righteousness, whose law with its stern moral demands on the conscience is inviolable and inexorable. Intensely earnest and unfalteringly courageous, they preached righteousness in season and out of season, denounced the people for their sins, called them to sincere repentance and threatened them, if they persisted in iniquity, with the severest judgments of God. They hoped and labored for a thorough internal moral reformation of the nation in its domestic, social and political life, and for a reign of righteousness and truth in the land. Was their labor successful and their hope fulfilled? Doubtless, many, and with advancing time, an increasing number, accepted the teachings of the prophets and became new centers of moral and spiritual force in society. But the great body of the nation did not understand, or at least turned a deaf ear to these heaven-

sent guides. In the eyes of the people generally, the prophets were enthusiasts, fanatics, unpatriotic revolutionists. To the people religion was something apart from morality; to the prophets it was nothing except as it found expression in morality. The people said, "Jahveh is our god and we are His people, bound to Him by a tie that cannot be broken; He is our patron and protector. Let our enemies rage as they may, no harm can come to us so long as we offer Him rich gifts and splendid sacrifices." The prophets said: "Your sacrifices, divorced from justice and mercy, truth and purity, are offensive to Jahveh. Religion is not ritual, but moral life rooted in reverential love to God." The result was a bitter conflict between the Prophets and the people, which continued down to the Exile. The prophets had failed to implant their ethical conception of Jahveh in the heart of the nation.

Indeed, affairs grew worse with the increasing misfortunes of the age. On the worship of Jahveh were engrafted features borrowed from the worship of "the other gods." For this commingling of cults, so dangerous to the religion of Jahveh, "the high places" afforded the requisite freedom. Every "high place" was a center of such syncretism, and of that licentiousness practiced by the heathen Semites in the name of religion. It was seen more and more clearly by the prophets that if idolatry was to be exterminated "the high places" must be abolished and all worship be confined to the central sanctuary in Jerusalem. The reform of the religion of Jahveh, which was practically the reform of the cultus, was the chief purpose of "the Book of the Law," now embodied in our Book of Deuteronomy. It was discovered in the year 621 B. C. by the high Priest Hilkiah, and made by Josiah, under apparently favorable circumstances, the basis of an extensive reformation. But after his early death, at Megiddo, idolatrous practices revived and the work of the king and his prophetic supporters proved a sad failure.

If the religion of Jahveh was ever to be spiritualized, there remained, after these abortive attempts, but one measure that could be taken, and it was a drastic measure. The people must

be violently torn from their native soil and transferred to a foreign home. This the prophet Jeremiah foresaw, and this he preached for twenty years. The vision was clear to him: the old order of things must be destroyed, and an entirely new beginning made. Religion must be freed from all national fetters. It must no longer be an affair of State, but an affair of the individual conscience. To this end the State must lose its political independence, the temple be laid in ashes, and the people torn away from all its old associations. Such was the severe measure to which Jahveh resorted.

What was the necessary effect of this terrible catastrophe on the popular mind? Many, we have reason to believe, accepted from the prophets the conception of Jahveh's rigidly ethical character. To them, as to Jeremiah and Ezekiel, these stern judgments seemed inevitable, and they yielded in humble submission. The others, in a strange land, without temple and without sacrifice, had ample time to reflect on the meaning of the dark calamities that had overwhelmed the nation. Of those who clung to the idea held in the Old Isreal that Jahveh was their national patron God, whose relation to His people might be strained but could not be broken, and who would, in virtue of that natural relation, protect them against all their foes, some, seeing the helplessness of Jahveh against the victorious gods of Babylon, apostasized from Him to them, while others, for the same reason, sank into religious indifference, built houses, planted vineyards, and got out of life what they could. There were others, however, who, seeking to interpret aright God's providential dealings with the nation, saw in His terrible judgments the vindication of the prophets. They came to know, as they never knew before, that Jahveh estimates life and conduct according to a moral standard, and that, therefore, the disasters and sufferings that befell the people were a just punishment for their sins. Jahveh appeared to them, through the prophetic teaching and their own personal experience, under a new aspect, and so, passionately clinging to religion, they felt compelled to renounce their old belief and adopt the new, which

had approved itself as true, and which they henceforth held with a deep consciousness of inward guilt. There was thus a violent sifting of the nation until there remained only a small but pious remnant.

And now a new problem arose: how can this remnant be so organized and guarded that it shall mirror the divine holiness in the ritual sense of that word? The earlier canonical prophets, from Amos onward, cherished the expectation that their noble ideal of a people of God would be gradually realized through the reformation of the State in its head and members. But in the reign of Manasseh the very existence of the religion of Jahveh was in danger. The prophets found it necessary to give to their ideal the practical form of a legal code. We have the result in the Deuteronomic legislation, which, unlike the Levitical legislation, is concerned with a civil polity. "At the head of the nation stands the king; over each district, guiding the affairs of town and village, are the presiding elders. It is true that the great aim of the book is a religious aim, and that for this purpose it must effect a reform of the popular worship. Its main object is to secure the complete devotion of the nation to Jahveh. But it does not contemplate the nation solely as a community for worship. Israel is a state, surrounded by other states; it is settled in a beautiful and fertile country; it is composed of families knit together by tender ties, of parents and children, rich and poor, righteous and unjust together; it is nourished by agriculture, it must prepare for war; it has a social life, independent of the sanctuary; and though it is not without ritual and sacred officers, it does not exist for the sake of the ritual. It is, in short, a State, and not a Church."<sup>\*</sup>

But the hopes of the Prophets were doomed to disappointment. The failure of Josiah's reformation made it probable and the destruction of the kingdom rendered it certain that a solution of the problem of establishing a true and faithful people of Jahveh could not be reached in a regenerated State. It remained to be seen whether it could be reached in a distinctively religious community, in a Church.

<sup>\*</sup> See *Modern Review*, January, 1884, pp. 4, 5.

Already in the first half of the Exile, Ezekiel, in the last nine chapters of his book, sketches his ideal of the New Israel. The king, indeed, finds a place in it, but his functions seem more religious than civil. It is the Temple, with its priests, around which all life revolves. This ideal was gradually enlarged and completed by his priestly successors, the result of whose activity in purifying, enriching and transforming the old cultus has been transmitted to us in the Priests' Code. "The king has disappeared, and from the sanctuary issues the high priest, already raised to such a representative eminence that his death makes an era, from which the years begin anew. The elders have vanished, and though certain shadowy forms, known as the 'Princes,' loom through the haze, these have no clear place in the organization of the people. The nation is transformed into the 'congregation'; the civil order seems absorbed in the ecclesiastical. 'The dwelling-place' planted in the midst of the camp, with the Priests and Levites encircling it, and the rest of the tribes disposed in order on its four sides, is but the symbol of the new idea by which the whole of existence is to be subjected to divine control. The entire ancient polity is enmeshed in an intricate net-work of ceremonial observances. And these are all instituted by direct revelation. The festival calendar, once the natural expression of the gladness of the seasons, is promulgated now from the Holy of Holies, at the supreme will of the Most High. The sacrifices are regulated by decrees from Heaven, and the minutest details are not thought unworthy of dictation by the Creator of the world. For each event of life, from birth to death, the appropriate observance is provided; and so the whole being of the nation becomes a vast perpetual service, the emblems of which are seen in daily offerings, and the ever-burning fire, and the supremacy of the consecrated caste."\*

When at length the time seemed to have arrived to introduce the new code, Ezra, who had come up to Jerusalem by the authority of the Persian king and with "the Law of his God" in his hand, assembled all the people and read in the Book of the Law of

\* *Modern Review*, January, 1884, pp. 5, 6.



God from morning till noon, until he had finished the reading and caused them to understand. Then the whole people took solemn oath to observe this Law, and the heads of families signed and sealed the obligation. It was then, October, 444 B. C., that the New Israel was born.

When we consider the ideas lying at the basis of the Priests' Code, it at once becomes evident that the sacrificial cultus had necessarily to undergo a great modification to make it conform to the religious thought of the new age. The old idea of sacrifice as a gift of food to God and a means of communion with Him disappears. It has become absurd to minds entertaining the prophetic conception of God. With that deeper consciousness of sin which the divine judgments on the nation have awakened, sacrifice receives a new meaning. Its sole purpose is now to serve as a means of atonement for the worshipper. How, and in what sense, it is atoning, I shall show hereafter, only remarking at this point that the principle dominating the transformed sacrificial system is clearly set forth in the classic passage, Lev. 17 : 11 : "The life (*nephesh*, soul) of the flesh is in the blood ; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement (not, "for the soul," as in the A. V., but) by means of the soul."

From this new point of view animal sacrifices acquire a value they had not before. In the Old Israel they stood on the same plane as the vegetable sacrifices. Both furnished the materials for the sacrificial meal. But now the vegetable offerings have come to occupy a very subordinate place. Some of them have disappeared altogether ; others have lost their former independence, and become mere appendages to the bloody offerings. The reason is apparent : only the animal sacrifices can furnish the means (the blood, in which resides the *nephesh*, the animating principle) by which atonement is made.

Moreover, while the two kinds of animal sacrifice found in the Old Israel, "the burnt-offering," *'olāh* and "the peace offering," *shelem*, are retained, they change places as regards importance. Whereas before the Exile, "the burnt-offering" is rarely found alone, now, in the cultus prescribed by the Priests' Code, it is



the inmost center of all worship. Such is its prominence that it gives its name to the altar on which not only "the burnt-sacrifice," but all other sacrifices were offered. In the Priests' Code, but there alone, the altar is designated "the altar of burnt-offering." Of such exceptional importance is this sacrifice that, whilst Ezekiel, conformably to custom in the time of the kings (2 Kings, 16: 15), prescribes in his sketch only one daily burnt-offering in the morning (Ezekiel 46: 13-15), the Levitical legislations prescribe two daily burnt-offerings, the first in the morning, the second in the evening. On account of its frequency it is named "the continual burnt-offering," *'ôlath hattâmîdh*, and when the author of the Book of Daniel wishes to say that the cultus was abolished, he says the *tâmîdh*, "the continual burnt-offering" was taken away (Dan. 8: 11 and elsewhere), as if this were the only, or at least the chief, sacrifice. On the other hand, "the peace-offerings" with the sacrificial meal, *shêlāmîm*, which once played the principal rôle in worship, retreat into the background and undergo a change of character. Ezekiel already ascribes to them an atoning power (Ezekiel 45: 15). To these sacrifices, the Priests' Code adds two new ones: the "sin-offering," *chattâth*, and the "trespass-offering," *'âshâm* which come to view first in Ezekiel and are then taken up into the Levitical legislation. They have special atoning efficacy in case of particular sins, while the burnt-offering has regard to sin in general.

Now the sacrifices presented by the Priests' Code—and with these alone I am now concerned—are of force only for those who stand in covenant with Jahveh. They are not for the heathen. They would not benefit even an Israelite, who should break the Covenant. They are for the Congregation of Israel, to make atonement for the members of the Jewish Church. All outside its pale, whether heathen or apostate Jews, who have trampled the Covenant under foot, derive no protection from the sacrifices of the Law. For they do not avail for sins of every kind. The Priests' Code distinguishes two grades of sins: *first*, sins committed "with a high hand," *b'yâdh rāmāh*; *second*, sins committed "through

ignorance," *bish'gāgāh*. The difference does not lie in this; that the commission of the first is intentional, the commission of the second unintentional; nor in this, that the transgressor, in the one case, sins consciously, in the other unconsciously. He who sins "with a high hand" is guilty of a decisive rejection of the Law, and deliberately opposes its divine ordinances. He breaks through the Covenant, and voluntarily places himself beyond the reach of its gracious provisions. For him there is no atonement but only destruction. All other sins are committed "through ignorance." For them and them alone, the sacrifices have atoning efficacy. It must be understood, however, that crimes with a penalty attached, are excluded. They are dealt with by civil law. The Priests' Code is purely ecclesiastical, and is limited to the sphere of communion with Jahveh in worship.

"Be ye holy, for I, Jahveh your God, am holy" (Lev. 19: 2): that is the fundamental principle underlying the priestly legislation. Jahveh is holy as the one only God, who in His nature is absolutely exalted above all that is earthly and unclean—majestic, stern, unapproachable, brooking nothing in His presence offensive to His dignity. Whatever is incompatible with His transcendent majesty is sin viewed as uncleanness. Because He is holy, His people must be holy, if they would enter into communion with Him. They must be pure; but the purity demanded is physical, no less than ethical. Even things—the sanctuary, its vessels and furniture, with the garments of the priests—are required to be holy, which is possible only in a material sense. So, too, they may contract defilement, which calls for atonement. In the Priests' Code the distinction between the material and moral is not sharply drawn. It does not neglect or ignore the moral. On the contrary, it is just here that we find the sum of all human duty in the second fundamental principle of religion: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev. 19: 18); as the Deuteronomist had already set forth the first fundamental principle, the love of God: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might" (Deut. 6: 5). But side by side with this

and many other grand moral precepts stand an immense number of ritual ordinances, relating often to what seem to us very trifling matters, such as contact with a dead animal; just as if the ritual stood on the same plane and were of equal importance with the moral. Is it not true, indeed, that this Code is mainly concerned with the distinction of clean and unclean, and the manner in which lost ceremonial purity may be recovered? "It was only those who were technically clean, who could appear before God, and the object of the elaborate sacrificial system was not to produce peace of mind for the individual, but to unify the community on a sound religious basis, maintaining its consecrated character unimpaired. The individual who voluntarily or involuntarily transgressed any precept of the law injured the sanctity of the community. As long, therefore, as his transgression was unatoned for, he was a source of danger to that organic whole of which he was a member. It mattered not whether the precept were moral or ritual the divine holiness had been wronged, and satisfaction had to be given, either by ceremonial means or by the cutting off of the offending branch from the present stem" (Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life After the Exile*, p. 74).

All sins committed "through ignorance" (*bish'gāgūh*) and all Levitical uncleanness disqualify the worshiper for communion with Jahveh. They do not amount to a breach of the Covenant punishable by death, or at least by excommunication, yet, as offensive to the divine holiness, they disturb the right relation between Jahveh and His people. In some way that relation must be restored before the offender can enter into the presence of his God. Uncleanness of the lower grade contracted, for example, by contact with a dead animal, continued "till even," and was then removed by merely bathing and washing the clothes; but for uncleanness of the higher grade, and for sins inadvertently committed there was needed an atonement by the offering of sacrifice, in virtue of which Jahveh could manifest his pardoning grace consistently with his holiness and without detriment to his established Law. But the sacrifices prescribed by the ritual Law have atoning efficacy, as has already been said, only for such as

stand in the Covenant. For one who has sinned "with a high hand," in defiance of Jahveh's will and in antagonism to the legal institute He has sanctioned, the prescribed sacrifices are of no avail. If the broken Covenant is to be reëstablished with one who has cast it aside and who on this account is threatened with the penalty of being cut off from his people, it must be by some extraordinary means, since no provision for such a case is made by the Levitical Legislation. The appointed sacrifices of the Priests' Code are not a means of salvation. They are for such as are already in a *state* of salvation and are designed to preserve them in that state. Sins committed through ignorance (and these alone it must be remembered, can be atoned by the regular sacrifices) together with all ritual impurity, are repellant to the holiness of Jahveh, and, if not atoned according to the way prescribed by the Law, would arouse his wrath. Sacrifice in the New Israel serves as a protective covering under which the worshiper can, without peril to life, draw near to his God.

And this brings me to do what I have thus far purposely refrained from doing, viz., to consider the meaning of the word rendered "*atone*," as it is employed in the ritual Law to express the aim and effect of the sacrifices prescribed. There can be little doubt that the primary physical sense of the Hebrew root *K P R*. is to *cover*. This sense is apparent in all its derivatives. The verb *kipper*, *atone* (Piel of *kāphar*, cover) denotes either (1) *a covering up* of something, so as to conceal it—a wrathful face, for example, so that it is no longer seen, or a wrong done, which, as thus hidden, is as if it were not; or (2) *a covering over* of something, so as to protect it from injury or danger. As thus technically employed, it no longer signifies a material, but, figuratively, *an ideal covering up* or *over*. Its usage is not always the same, and the differences need to be carefully noted. With a view of arriving at the exact meaning ascribed to *kipper*, *atone*, in the ritual Law, let us first see how the word is employed in the extra-ritual literature. And here we must distinguish between its religious and its non-religious use.

There are two passages (Prov. 16 : 14 and Gen. 32 : 21) in

which the verb *kipper* is applied to the "relation of man to man. They have this in common that in both a wrong done by one man to another stirs up a dangerous wrath, which necessitates a *kapper* or atoning act. Prov. 16:14 reads: "The wrath of a king is as messengers of death, but a wise man will pacify it. (*Y<sup>e</sup> kapp<sup>r</sup> rennâh.*) The object of the verb is in this case a king's wrath threatening death. The means by which the act is accomplished are not expressly stated. It is only said that a wise man will know how to deal with such wrath, doubtless by offering gifts or performing acts which serve to restrain its outburst. Here the verb can only signify to *appease, mitigate, pacify wrath.*

The second passage (Gen. 32:21, A. V. 20) reads "For he said I will appease him (*'äkapp<sup>r</sup>râh pânâv*, literally, will cover his face) with the present that goeth before me, and afterward I will see his face; peradventure he will accept of me" (lift up my face). Jacob had wronged Esau, and feared to see the angry face of his brother without first covering it with a gift (*minchâh*) which should hide Esau's wrath.

In its religious use the word *kipper*, *atone*, whether found in the ritual Law or out of it, never denotes a covering of Jahveh's face, eyes, or wrath. It would have seemed an irreverent, if not, indeed, a blasphemous thought, that man by any outward gifts could appease the anger of God, or blind his eyes as with a bribe not to look on sin. Such a mode of conception appears in heathenism, not in the religion of the New Israel which we are now discussing. It is inconsistent with His majesty and holiness. God, it is true, may of his own motion hide his face from the sins of His people (Ps. 51:11, Heb. V.9, A. V.); He may do this out of compassion for them, or for His name's sake. That, however, is very different from having His face concealed by any gift offered by man.

What, then, is the distinctively religious meaning of *kipper*? It must be noted that the term is employed in one way in the ritual Law, and in quite another in the extra-ritual literature. Outside of the priestly legislation the *object* of the covering is sin, or guilt, in several instances, blood innocently shed, but never the guilty person.

The *subject* who *atones* or covers sin is, when named, in most cases God himself, actuated by motives derived from His own nature, or from his relation to Israel and to the heathen nations. The reason which makes the atoning act necessary, viz., sin, and the effect of the atoning act, viz., such a covering of sin as to withdraw it from the gaze of the offended party, are essentially the same as when one man appeases the anger of another whom he has wronged. But there is this great difference that in the one case it is the *offending* person who *atones* (covers) the face or wrath of the person offended, while in the other it is the *offended* person who covers, not the person of the offender, but his sin. Here the act of covering (*atoning*) sin is equivalent to forgiving it. But in the extra-ritual literature the means employed for covering (*atoning*) sin is never sacrifice. In I Sam. 3: 14, Jahveh, indeed, says; "I have sworn unto the house of Eli that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged (*atoned*, *yithkapper*) with sacrifice nor offering forever." The statement, however, is negative, though it implies the possibility that sin may be covered by sacrifice.

Let us now see how the technical term *kipper* is applied in the ritual Law, where the ordinary means of atonement is a bloody sacrifice. And, first, the atoning act has not *God* as its *object*. It is performed in His presence, before Him, at His sanctuary; but He is in no sense the object covered. In the relation of man to man an offender may cover with a gift the face or wrath of the one offended. In the relation of man to God such an idea finds no application. No covering can hide sin from the eye of God. It offends His holiness, which reacts strongly against it. The sin which the ritual Law has in view is not sin committed "with a high hand," involving a breach of the Covenant and rebellion against Jahveh. All such sin lies outside the sphere in which the sacrifices have atoning efficacy. If atoned at all, it can be only by extraordinary means, not by the prescribed sacrifices of the Law. It is only for inadvertent sin (*bish' gāgāh*) and Levitical uncleanness that the ceremonial law provides. Nor does the ritual idea of the atonement presuppose that the worshipper



who offers sacrifice is an object of God's wrath, but only that his condition is such that, without special precaution, approach to God would be perilous. It is only when such precaution has been neglected that Jahveh's wrath is aroused. Neglect of this kind verges on a defiance of Jahveh's legal ordinances. The sacrifices of the law, therefore, are assigned not to appease the divine wrath, but to prevent it from being enkindled.

Nor, secondly, is *sin* or *guilt* the object of the atoning act, as in the extra-ritual literature. Sin affords the occasion for the act of covering or atoning, but it is not that which is covered or atoned. The formula in the Priestly Law reads: "to make atonement for him" or "for his soul" (*l'kappēr 'ālāv* or *'al naphshô*). This is often taken as if it read "to make atonement for the sin of his soul" (*'āl chattâth naphshô*), as if this were the complete form, of which the other is an abbreviation; and, indeed, in the formula for the sin-offering we do find after "for him" (*'ālāv*) also *'āl chattâthô*, where the preposition *'al* might have the same local meaning as in *'ālāv* "over him." The phrase *'al chattâthô* would then be in apposition to *'ālāv*, defining it more closely, and the formula would read: "to make a covering over him, over his sin." But since *'al chattâthô* alternates with *mêchattâthô*, the *'al* of the one phrase must have the same signification as the *min* of the other, both marking the reason for the covering of the worshipper.

The object of the atoning act then, is not the sin of the offerer, but, thirdly, his *person*, his soul, his life. The verb *kippēr* in this case is never construed with the accusative, but with *'al*, over, sometimes with *ô'adh*, which with a verb of protecting signifies *about*. The idea it expresses is that of a covering made over or about the person for whose benefit the sacrifice is offered, to enable him, thus protected, to come into the presence of God without danger of arousing his wrath. This includes forgiveness and purification. Hence the statement in connection with the sin-offering "and it shall be forgiven him," viz., his sin committed "through ignorance," as well as "that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord."

When the object is not persons, but things, the tabernacle, the altar and other *sacra*—the verb is construed with the accusative, as well as with '*al*', an indication that in this case the covering is not so much to protect the object, as it is to conceal the impurity contracted, and so withdraw it from the sight of God.

The *subject* who performs the atoning act is not the offending person, nor yet Jahveh before whom the atonement is made, but the priest, the mediator between man and God. And the *means* of atonement is the sacrificial blood, according to the principle stated in Lev. 17: 11: "The *nephesh* (soul here equal animal life) of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement (*l'kappēr*, to make a protective covering) for your souls (*al-naphshôthêkem*, over your souls, your lives), for it is the blood that maketh an atonement (*y'kappēr*, that maketh a protective covering) by means of the soul" (*bannephesh*, not, as in A. V., "for," in behalf of, but *by* the soul or life resident in the blood).

It would seem that no statement could well be clearer. Yet theologians have often seen, or thought they saw, in these words *the idea of a penal satisfaction*. The sacrificial victim is supposed to take the place of the sinner, who transfers his guilt to it by the imposition of his hands upon its head. Innocent, yet bearing the burden of another's sins, the victim endures the penalty of death which should by right have fallen on the guilty offerer. Blood must be shed, and when shed affords the needed satisfaction to the divine holiness and secures to the sinner his longed-for pardon. Is such a view of the sacrifices, especially of the sin offering, prescribed in the Priests' Code (with which alone we are now dealing) tenable in the light of the foregoing discussion? Do they embody the idea of a vicarious penal satisfaction? Remember I am not now discussing the Satisfaction-theory of the atonement, as taught by Anselm and other Christian theologians. That theory may be true or it may not. I am only asking whether it underlies the sacrifices of the ritual Law. And I have no hesitation in saying that it does not. Let us look at a few unquestionable facts.

In the first place, this view of the aim and effect of the regular sacrifices laid down in the Levitical legislation, is false in its pre-suppositions. It ignores the distinction between sinning "with a high hand," and sinning through inadvertence or error (*bish'gāgāh*). Sins of the former kind are committed, as we have seen, in defiance of the Covenant and its divine ordinances. They place the offender outside of the gracious provisions of the Covenant. Their penalty is death, and for those who are guilty of them there is no atonement possible by the regular ordinary sacrifices. Any view of the sacrifices of the Law which supposes they were designed to atone for sins which incur the penalty of death is sadly mistaken. It is only sins of inadvertence and ceremonial uncleanness, for which these sacrifices avail. The penalty attached to such sins is not death, but exclusion from communion with Jahveh until atonement has been made. The victim is not a substitute for the offerer, its death obviating the necessity of his death. Whatever else the sacrifices prescribed by the ritual Law may mean, they do not mean this.

Secondly, if the view under consideration were correct, that the atoning power lies in the *death* of the victim, then the killing of the victim would have central significance. In fact, however, it plays only a subordinate part in the atoning rite. It is not, as we should expect, the priest, but the offerer himself, who is the slayer, except in the case of the two turtle doves, or two young pigeons offered by the poor. The *priest* is required to make the atonement, the protective covering over the person of the offerer; and if the death of the victim were the specific means of the atonement, the priest would necessarily have to perform the all-important act of killing the victim. But it is not till the fatal blow has been struck and the living blood gushes from the open wound that the priest takes part in the service. Manifestly, what is of primary consideration is not to destroy the life of the animal which is to be offered to God. A dead thing would not be an object worthy of His acceptance. The slaying is not an end in itself. It is simply the means of securing the blood, the seat of the *nephesh*, the life of the victim, which, by

the priest's sprinkling of the blood about the altar, is to be surrendered and appropriated to God. Accordingly, when the offerer slays the animal the priest is present with a basin to catch the living blood. It is a living not a dead thing that covers and protects the offerer before God.

Thirdly, the sacrificial animal could become a substitute for the death-deserving offerer and suffer the penalty due to his sin only if his guilt were in some way transferred to the victim. And this has been supposed to be the case. The offerer lays his hand upon the head of the victim before it is slain; and this is interpreted to mean the imposition of his sins that they may be expiated by the animal's death. Suppose this interpretation correct: would not the victim thus laden with guilt, even though it be the guilt of another necessarily be an unclean thing? On the contrary, the flesh of the sin-offering is pronounced "most holy" (*qōdhesh qōdhāshim*)—so holy that it cannot be eaten by the worshipper, but only by the priests, the representatives of God, and that in a holy place, the court of the tent of meeting. Indeed whoever touches the flesh is holy (Lev. 6: 25-27; vv. 18-20 in Heb). How then can the laying on of the offerer's hands be conceived to mean the transfer of his sins to the innocent victim? This meaning is simply put into the act of the laying on of the offerer's hand, which is, indeed, nowhere explained, but which, in view of what has just been said, cannot signify the conveyance of guilt from the offerer to his victim. You will remember the two goats on which lots were cast on the Day of the Atonement; one lot for Jahveh and the other lot for Azazel (as in R. V., not the "scape-goat," as in A. V.). After killing the goat allotted to Jahveh, and making atonement by means of its blood, Aaron takes the other goat which was allotted to Azazel (the name of an evil spirit), lays both his hands on the head of the live goat, confesses over it all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat (Lev. 16: 21). Here there is a real putting of sins upon the goat by the laying on of hands. But mark: it is not on the goat that is slain for a sin-offering to make atonement, but on

the goat that is preserved alive to carry the sins of the people into the wilderness; and so unclean is this sin-bearing goat, that Aaron, after having sent it into the wilderness by the hand of one who stood in waiting, is required to wash his flesh with water in a holy place, and then make atonement for himself and for the people by presenting one burnt-offering for himself and another for the people (Lev. 16:23, 24). Evidently the imposition of Aaron's hands on the goat destined for Azazel has quite a different signification from the imposition of the offerer's hand on the head of his victim. What is the signification of this latter ceremony? There are three acts which the offerer himself performs: 1st. He brings to the altar the animal to be sacrificed, thus expressing his desire that atonement be made for him; 2d. He puts his hand on the animal's head, indicating in this way that the animal is his, and has been brought to the altar for an offering to Jahveh; and 3d, he slays the animal, thus renouncing all right of possession, and appropriating it wholly to his God. All this is preliminary to the specific act of atonement which is performed by the priest when he sprinkles the blood on or about the altar. The slaying has no other aim than to secure the sacrificial blood, the prescribed means of atonement. It is the blood, or rather the soul (*nephesh*, life) seated in the blood, that atones; and this is conveyed to Jahveh by the priest's act of sprinkling the altar. Is there anywhere in this sacrificial rite, from the bringing of the victim to the altar to the sprinkling of its blood, the slightest hint of penal satisfaction?

I have only yet to remark that the idea of sacrifice reaches its Old Testament culmination in that marvelous picture of the Suffering Servant of Jahveh, so graphically sketched in Is. 53. Here sacrifice is lifted up into the human sphere, and is, in the truest sense of the word, vicarious. The servant voluntarily puts himself in the place of his people, bears their griefs and carries their sorrows, is wounded for their transgressions and bruised for their iniquities. What is significant in this is the manner in which he sacrifices himself. The suffering he endures is not borne in a simply passive way; he assumes it of his own free

34 *The Idea of Sacrifice as Developed in the Old Testament.*

will. It is, indeed, imposed on him by Jahveh for the iniquity of the people, yet not in blindly raging wrath. The whole transaction, both on the part of God and of His servant, is ruled by ethical motives or accomplished in an ethical way. Chastisement was laid upon him, and he bore it voluntarily as well as patiently, because it was for the peace, the welfare of his people. By his stripes they were healed. We seem here to be lifted up out of the Old Testament into the New. And, indeed, when stript of its national limitations, the picture here drawn by the prophet, rightly named the Old Testament evangelist, may well be regarded as the ideal realized by the vicarious atoning sacrifice of our Lord.



## II.

### THE OCCASION AND ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

BY A. E. TRUXAL.

#### INTRODUCTION.

The observation has frequently been made that no one is able to understand properly the age in which he lives. He is himself too much connected with his own age and too near the events as they transpire and cannot view the period in the light of future results and consequences. Those of a later day who can make the age more objective to themselves, and look back upon it, will be able to obtain a better general view of it, apprehend it more accurately and comprehend it more thoroughly. In the æsthetic sphere "Distance lends enchantment to the view." In the department of history distance enables persons to acquire a correcter knowledge of any period of the world's life.

But there is after all a limit to this general proposition. It is possible for one to be too far away from a given age to gain a proper understanding of it. We have felt this to be the case in our own study of the Apostolic age of the Christian church. It is very difficult for us in this nineteenth century to discover and properly appreciate all the conditions of society, religious and otherwise, when the Christian church was born and passed through her childhood period. It is true we have the New Testament Scriptures and they together with the writings of the Old Testament and of secular authors furnish us with various views of the affairs of men of that age and of the events that then transpired. But it is so easy to look upon the things of those early times through colored glasses. We are so apt to read our own present feelings and conceptions into the words and statements of the ancient writers. In fact it seems impossible for

us to free ourselves entirely of our theories and convictions so as to view the history of the beginning of the church as it in reality unfolded itself. Our effort must consequently be not to allow our preconceived notions and beliefs to interfere with our vision. The present paper is an attempt to view the subject under consideration in its own early light, suffering the facts as they then existed to speak for themselves.

# I.

The first thing which we would fix clearly in our mind is the fact that Jesus was a Jew. He was born of Jewish parents, brought up according to the customs of the Jews, and was Himself all His days obedient to the requirements of the Jewish law. He at no time renounced His faith as a Jew or set aside the law. He evidently regarded the law as divine and in His teaching brought out and applied its true spiritual meaning. He based His doctrines on Moses and the prophets and defended His course of action by them. His disciples were Jews and had no thought of forsaking the faith and customs of the fathers. And if Jesus had ignored the law or treated it contemptuously they would not have hearkened unto His words or obeyed His command or walked with Him any more. In Matt. 5 : 17 He says "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil." He found no fault with the Jews for observing the law but for not keeping it properly and for making the word of God void by their traditions. He taught that the sum and substance of the law was love to God and love to man. Instead of condemning them for keeping the law He censured them for not observing it fully. "Ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, judgment, and mercy, and faith: *but these ye ought to have done and not to have left the other undone*" (Matt. 23 : 23). Whilst the discourse of Jesus in John 8 : 31-51 deals with a conception of sin deeper and broader than simply the legalistic idea, yet when he challenged the Jews to convict Him of sin they undoubtedly would have charged against Him His violations of the law

if they could have done so with any truth and justice at all. By his words and works Jesus did indeed exhibit principles which looked towards the reception into the kingdom of God of those not members of the Jewish commonwealth, but it is quite evident from their subsequent course of action that the disciples had no other thought but that all such outsiders must first submit to the requirements of the law before they could enter the kingdom by faith in Christ Jesus. Jesus from first to last was obedient to the law. It was in connection with the observance of the passover festival that He was betrayed, condemned, and crucified. And there is no evidence anywhere that He directed his disciples not to obey the law of Moses. When He said unto them "except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven," they unquestionably understood that they were to observe the law most scrupulously both in its literal sense and also in its spiritual meaning and force as explained by Him.

## II.

And this brings us to note the second fact, namely that the first Christians were Jews, and observed the Jewish customs and laws; not only during the time they walked with the Lord before His ascension to glory, but afterwards also after the Holy Ghost had been poured out upon them. It is so easy for us to imagine that the disciples of Christ from the day of Pentecost on separated themselves entirely from the Jewish church, abandoned the observance of the laws and ceremonies of the Jews and formed a congregation of their own, practicing nothing but the christian rites and ordinances. But such was evidently not the case. While they preached repentance and faith in Christ Jesus and exhorted the people who hearkened unto them to be baptized for the remission of sins, while they would meet in each others houses in a social and religious manner, engaging in prayer with one accord and edifying each other by recalling and repeating the sayings and doings of the Lord and breaking bread and passing the cup of blessing in observance of the Lord's Supper as instituted

on the night of betrayal, yet they at the same time also observed the requirements of the law as they had done before. They went up to the temple at the hour of prayer, they kept the feasts and circumcised their children. And they would not permit any one to join the company of believers who had not been circumcised, nor would they eat with any such. In their mind, in order to become a Christian one had first to submit to the requirements of the law. When St. Paul took Titus, one of his gentile converts and a co-laborer with him, along to Jerusalem the stricter ones among the Jewish Christians desired that he should be circumcised in order to his admission to their full christian fellowship. St. Paul however would not hear to this for a moment. When the apostle to the Gentiles in later years again visited the mother church and reported to them specifically what great things the Lord had done by his hands they received him gladly, but James and the elders said unto him: "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands there be among the Jews of them which have believed; and they are zealous for the law; and they have been informed concerning thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." Not a word is recorded anywhere that the strictest among them ever preferred any such charges against James or Peter or any others of the apostles, and this fact is conclusive evidence that the apostles and elders and all the people of the church at Jerusalem continued faithfully in the observance of the law. Of Peter's conduct at Cæsarea and at Antioch we will speak later on.

Two reasons, no doubt, worked powerfully in their minds, constraining them to be careful in their obedience to the law of Moses. The first was their belief that the teaching of the Lord required this at their hands. Jesus had kept the law, why should not they? He had at no time absolved them from the observance of the Jewish customs. And how could their righteousness exceed that of the scribes and pharisees if they did not scrupulously obey the teaching of Moses and the prophets? And did He not say that the children's meat was not to be given to the

dogs? They evidently believed it to be the Lord's will that they should faithfully maintain the customs of the fathers. And this would powerfully incline their hearts to do so. And in the second place they undoubtedly believed it to be their duty to labor for the conversion of their own countrymen to faith in Christ Jesus. Their Master had consecrated His efforts to the accomplishment of this end. He lived, labored, suffered and died for the salvation of the Jews. And His disciples now undoubtedly felt the obligation upon them to bring their own people into the Kingdom of God. The direction given them by the Lord according to Acts 1: 8, was that they should begin their labors at Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria. These places were inhabited by their fellow Jews. These were consequently first of all to be converted. The bringing in of the gentiles was to their minds most likely a very secondary matter. But they knew very well too that in order to obtain a hearing at all at the hands of their fellowmen they must observe the law of Moses. A refusal to do so would have effected a rupture between them at once, and that was by all means to be avoided. In order that they might commend themselves and their doctrine to the Jewish household they faithfully practiced the customs they had learned from childhood. And especially would they do so because like their Master they regarded the law as divine and binding upon them. They realized no inconsistency between the observance of the law and the practice of the gospel of forgiveness and salvation through faith in Christ Jesus and baptism into His name.

The christians of Jerusalem continued to be members of the Jewish household until they emigrated in a body to Pella, in Perea, shortly before the destruction of the temple city. In their new home they elected a man by name of Symeon, who was said to have been a nephew of Joseph, "to the official head of the Christian community." With the destruction of the temple and the dispersion of the Jews the connection of the believers in Christ with the ancient worship was severed, and the Christians now became definitely and distinctly a congregation of their own. In addition to the believers in Palestine there were some

Jewish converts scattered throughout the gentile world who continued for a time, at least, to cling to the observance of the Jewish law and customs, but this number was comparatively small. The majority of Israelites converted to Christ in gentile communities readily accepted the position that Christians were no longer subject to the law of Moses. Yet the idea that the law ought to be retained and its ceremonies performed lingered for some time in the christian church and gave rise to the heretical sect known as Ebionites.

Objection may be raised to the above position, that the christians at Jerusalem maintained the Jewish laws and customs, on the ground that Peter baptized Cornelius, the gentile, and had christian fellowship with him. This was an exception and does not annul the general practice. Peter and Cornelius each had a vision and each regarded his vision as a voice of God speaking to him and acted in obedience to the vision. The apostle preached the Gospel to Cornelius and the company with him, and the Holy Ghost was poured out upon them, and St. Peter baptized them. What else could he do? And seeing the faith of these gentiles and the manifest evidences of the presence of the Holy Spirit with them he hesitated not to tarry and eat with them some days. But St. Peter was upon his return to Jerusalem taken to account for his conduct at Cæsarea. He based his defense on his vision and on the gift of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon Cornelius and those with him. He was silent according to the record on the matter of eating with them. This event could not help but make an impression upon Peter and the brethren at Jerusalem. They were forced to admit that gentiles might become partakers with them of the grace of Christ, but they could not consent that they should be received into full communion and fellowship with those who were of the household of Israel. It is very evident from their subsequent course of conduct that they did not look upon this event as an abrogation of the law for them. They practiced it as faithfully afterwards as before. When St. Peter later visited the church at Antioch, he in the first place fellowshiped socially and religiously with gentile and Jewish christians alike. He



worshipped and ate the Lord's Supper with them, thus acknowledging by his conduct that they all stood on the same plane with one another. Afterwards, when certain ones came from James to visit this church, St. Peter withdrew from the gentiles and fellowshiped only with the Jewish converts; he did this in obedience to the law which forbade the Jews from holding intercourse with uncircumcised gentiles. St. Paul upon his return to Antioch rebuked St. Peter sharply face to face before all for his conduct in this matter. What is the explanation of the course of St. Peter in this case? One explanation is that he in the first place acted on his convictions and in the second place allowed his convictions to be overruled by fear of the visitors from St. James. We question this. We incline to believe that his conviction all the time yet was that the law ought to be maintained and that both at Cæsarea and at Antioch by an impulse called forth by what he saw of the faith in Jesus and of the fruits of the Spirit on the part of the gentiles, he did that which the law forbade. His impulses accordingly on these occasions were right, but his general convictions wrong. We would yet in this connection call attention to the great credit due both to Peter and James for their wisdom displayed in mediating between the Jewish and gentile wings of the early church. They rejoiced in the conversion of gentiles and commended the work of St. Paul and his co-laborers, and at the same time they encouraged the Jewish christians in observing the requirements of the law. They did not break with those of the circumcision nor yet reject those of the uncircumcision who gave evidence of the genuineness of their faith, and requested that the gentile believers remember the poor of the mother church, a proposition to which St. Paul heartily assented, and thus they prevented an open rupture between the two branches of the early church, which would have been a great calamity, had it taken place.

### III.

Let us now turn to St. Paul. He had been a zealous Jew and a persecutor of christians. On his way to Damascus he was

miraculously converted. He was baptized and received instruction in the christian faith by one Ananias. He went to Arabia and again returned to Damascus preaching the Gospel. At the end of three years he went to Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion where his christian character was vouched for by Barnabas. He remained only fifteen days in the city. He met Cephas and "James, the brother of the Lord," but saw none "other of the Apostles." Thence he went to Syria and Cilicia, where for eleven years he preached the Gospel mainly to the gentiles. A congregation was established at Antioch, by whom it is not known. But it is said of the place that "a great number of them that believed turned unto the Lord." A report of the important work being done at Antioch reached the brethren at Jerusalem. They sent Barnabas to this city, who, after investigation, was so impressed with the importance of the work to be done there, that he went to Tarsus and persuaded Paul to come to his assistance; and they two continued there a whole year teaching the christian faith to "much people."

The Gospel preached by St. Paul was pitched on a somewhat different key from that preached in Jerusalem. His commission was to labor among the gentiles. He preached Christ and Him crucified, and taught that in Him the law had been fulfilled. Hence he received into the christian community all who repented of their sins, believed in the Lord Jesus Christ and were baptized, without demanding of them submission to the requirements of the law. He took the position that Jesus was the Saviour of all who believe in His name, whether they be Jew or Greek, barbarian, scythian, bond or free, and hence all are one in Christ, and all stand on the same level in their communion and fellowship with Him and with one another. Consequently, he could not accept the teaching that it was necessary for gentiles to become Jews in order to their admission to full christian communion. Barnabas, a Jewish christian, and Titus, a gentile convert, labored with St. Paul on the basis of these principles, and their work was greatly blessed with many good results. Reports of their doings among the gentiles reached the ears of those

at Jerusalem from time to time. And St. Paul learned, too, of the doubts and adverse opinions expressed by members of the mother church in reference to his teaching and practices. With the view of reconciling his work to the minds of the leaders and people of the Church at Jerusalem, Paul, with Titus and others, visited them and laid before them an account of their accomplishments. Without endeavoring to adjust the visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem, as recorded in Acts 9, 11:30, and 15, with those he mentions in chapters 1 and 11 of his Epistle to the Galatians, we accept the indisputable fact that he and his co-laborers did go to the mother Church for the purpose of defending themselves against the prejudice that existed and the charge that had been circulated against them. The charge that he ignored the requirements of the law was always in one form or another preferred against him. It does not appear that the nature of the Gospel which he was preaching or was to preach, was discussed at all at the time of his visit from Damascus. Probably the matter had not yet formulated itself in his own mind. But in the subsequent visit, reported in Acts 15, it is said that after Paul and those with him had related what God had done by them, some of the believing Jews declared "that it was needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses." And again, when the Apostle for the last time visited the city the charge against him was that he taught all the Jews, "who are among the gentiles, to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither walk after their customs." This charge repeated again and again, and never denied by him, but always defended, gives us a tolerably correct view of the variations in the teachings of the two different portions of the church at the time.

During a visit which St. Peter made to the Church of Antioch he found Jews and gentiles of the faith so closely cemented together in one fellowship in Christ Jesus that he could not refrain from mingling freely on equal terms with those of the uncircumcision. But, when in the course of time certain ones came from James who were opposed to this union of Jewish with gentile

christians, Peter drew back and clung to those of the circumcision only and would thenceforth have nothing to do with the Gentiles. And even Barnabas, who had been a co-laborer with St. Paul allowed himself to be drawn away with the Jewish party. But when St. Paul appeared amongst them he withstood Peter face to face and rebuked him for his conduct in the matter. The result, however, was a division in the congregation which evidently continued for some time afterwards. Soon after this event some teachers of the Jewish persuasion whom St. Paul designated as "troublers" appeared among the churches of Galatia and endeavored to undermine the work of the apostle by insisting upon it that all christians must needs keep the law in order to the reception of the grace and salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ. For the purpose of destroying the evil influences of these "troublers" St. Paul wrote the epistle to the Galatians, which by many biblical scholars is now regarded as the first epistle written by the Apostle to the Gentiles. This epistle we will now take briefly under consideration.

#### IV.

From this letter to the Galatians it is very evident that these teachers made an attack upon St. Paul and his teaching. They took the position: (1) that Paul was not an apostle; (2) that he had not received the Gospel he preached from the Lord; (3) that he must be dependent upon and subject to the apostles at Jerusalem who alone were the authorized leaders of the christian faith; (4) that he was not their true friend; (5) that he also at times taught the necessity of circumcision; (6) that he set aside the law of Moses and the customs of the fathers which were maintained from the beginning of the church at Jerusalem under apostolic instruction.

That they had assaulted his character as an apostle is evident from the manner in which he began his epistle, which was written as a reply to them. And, in fact, it does not appear anywhere that the apostles and elders at Jerusalem ever really admitted his apostleship. They had given to him and Barnabas

the right hand of christian fellowship and acknowledged the christian character of their work. But they could do this without admitting that Paul was an apostle on equal footing with the twelve. The qualification of an apostle in their view was that he must have been a follower of the Lord and an eye witness of His death and resurrection. On this basis Matthias was chosen to take the place of Judas, and in all probability after the martyrdom of James, the son of Zebedee, they filled the vacancy by the selection of James, the brother of the Lord. It is not unlikely that the prevailing sentiment among the Jerusalem christians was that Paul was not an apostle in the full sense, and had not received his commission from the Lord, and hence was not a final authority as to the requirements of the Gospel. At any rate the teachers that had visited the Galatian churches evidently denied his apostolic character. Consequently he, at the very beginning of his epistle, vindicates himself by declaring most positively that he is "an apostle, not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised Him from the dead." And, further, he declares that the gospel which he preached he had not "received from man, but through revelation of Jesus Christ." And, further, evidently under great excitement, he exclaims with repetition that if any one, man or angel, should preach to them any gospel other than that which he had preached, "let him be accursed." And in vindication of the claim that he labored by the direct authority and commission of the Lord and not by man, he states that God had revealed His Son to him that he might preach christ among the Gentiles; and that he had not sat at the feet of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem to learn of them; that not till after three years of his conversion had he gone to Jerusalem and then remained only fifteen days and saw none of the apostles save Cephas, and James, the brother of the Lord; that he then went to Syria and Cilicia, where he labored independently of the twelve, till, in the course of fourteen years, he, by revelation again, with Barnabas and Titus, went to see those at Jerusalem and lay before them the gospel which

he preached to the gentiles and the results following ; that he, at that time, positively refused to hearken to the demand that Titus should be circumcised ; and that the conclusion reached was that James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to Barnabas and him the right hand of christian fellowship, and that " we should go unto the Gentiles and they unto the circumcision." Thus he claimed that his authority as an apostle, and his message depended in no wise upon the twelve or upon the church of Jerusalem, but came to him immediately from the Lord Himself. The apostle calls attention to the occurrence at Antioch, to which reference has already been made, when he publicly rebuked Peter for his course of conduct ; which is an evidence that he did not regard himself as subject to any other apostle.

And how can he be their enemy when he preached the truth to them ? When he first appeared amongst them they received him as an angel of God, and would have done anything for him. They knew that he sought their good. These " troublers " seek them " in no good way," but they desire to alienate them from the apostle in order that they might win them to their ways. He is in travail even then until christ be formed in them, and wishes that he might be with them for their good, " But, brethren," says he, " if I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted." " Behold I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing." For circumcision is not simply a separate act, but he that submits to that rite makes himself " debtor to the whole law." He thereby places himself under the entire Jewish system. He takes upon himself the yoke of bondage. Against that St. Paul argues strongly and profoundly, and sets forth the truth that faith in Christ supersedes the whole law. If any desire to observe the customs of the fathers they are at liberty to do so, but not as being essential to salvation in Christ Jesus, for by the works of the law no man is justified but alone through faith, and if any believers do not wish to observe the law, they are not required to do so, for the purpose of the law has been subserved. The grace of the Lord is assured to all who believe



in His name, are baptized unto Him, and walk in His commandment, which is to love one another. The apostle appeals to their experience before whose eyes Jesus Christ had been set forth crucified. Did they receive the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith? They know that by faith through the hearing of the Gospel of Christ they received the gift of the Spirit. Would they then turn from the Spirit to the flesh? God who gave the Spirit and wrought miracles among them did it through the hearing of faith. And this is in harmony with and in fulfillment of the experience of Abraham. The promise was given to the patriarch because of his faith and not because of the works of the law, for the law was not yet, neither could the law which was given many years afterwards set aside the promise of faith. The inheritance then is by promise on the basis of faith. And they who now are led by faith are "the sons of Abraham." Did the law then have no end to accomplish? Yea, truly, it served as a tutor to lead up to Christ. But now that Christ has come and fulfilled all righteousness, the law ceases to have any essential value. Its end has been accomplished. Men now are the sons of God by faith in Christ. They are justified by faith. As many as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ. And thus all the distinctions and separations that the law had made are broken down and removed, and hence persons are no longer to be regarded as Jew or Greek, bond or free, male or female, for all "are one in Christ Jesus." Those then who are Christ's are Abraham's seed and heirs of promise. But an heir under age is not free, for he is placed under a guardian. The law was the guardian and tutor of the children of Israel until Christ came in the fullness of time when the children reached their maturity in Him who gave them their freedom and made them the real sons of God. How foolish it would be for them to turn back again to the bondage of the law. And as to the gentile christians, they had been in servitude to their false gods, but by the preaching of the Gospel they had come to know the true God and be known of Him and obtained their liberty in Christ Jesus. Would they "turn back to the weak and beggarly rudiments" and "be in bondage over

again?" The law itself bears testimony to the truth of his position as is made manifest by the son of the handmaid and the son of the free woman. Isaac was the son of the free woman, the child of promise and hence the heir of the promise. But such was not the case with the son according to the flesh. He was cast out. Christians are the children of the free woman. Christ has set them free. By faith in Him they are the heirs of promise. Hence, says St. Paul, stand fast in your liberty. And remember ye who would yield to the claim of circumcision, that submission to that rite makes you "debtor to the whole law." But if you surrender yourselves to the law you make Christ of no avail. Yet the believer's only hope is in Christ the Lord. And "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love." Therefore in Him are ye free, no longer under bondage to the law. Ye live by faith.

But the members of the Galatian churches might be tempted, as christians in all subsequent ages have been tempted to misapprehend the true nature of their freedom and as a consequence abuse it. In order to guard them against falling into such an error the apostle closes his epistle with an extended exhortation not to use their liberty "as an occasion to the flesh." But in their lives and deeds they are to produce the fruits of faith. They shall love each other, not bite and devour one another; they shall live by the spirit and not "fulfil the lusts of the flesh." "The works of the flesh are manifest" he says, and he enumerates them. The fruits of the spirit are of a different kind, and he mentions them. He gives directions as to the treatment of an erring brother and as to their attitude towards one another in general. They are to be helpful and beneficial to each other in spiritual things. He lays down the law in regard to sowing to the flesh and sowing to the spirit, and exhorts them to persevere patiently in well doing. And finally he refers again to those who would compel them to be circumcised, and charges that they do so because they shrink from the persecution of the cross, and that they even do not themselves keep the law. As for himself he will glory alone in "the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ,"

through which the world has been crucified unto him and He unto the world. "For neither is circumcision anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

#### CONCLUSION.

The discussion of the foregoing subject brings to view clearly the fact that christianity in its early stages was characterized by growth. It was not ushered into the world on the day of Pentecost, or any other time, in a fully developed form, whether of doctrine, ceremonies or worship. The christian church had her childhood, and she grew into manhood. The life of the man is in the child, so the essential life of the church was present in the beginning. Her members believed in Jesus Christ, the son of the living God, as the Saviour of men and the only hope and comfort of the believer. They everywhere preached Christ and Him crucified. They were from the beginning ready to suffer and die for their faith. But they did not seem to have a clear conception of all that was involved in the christian faith. They did not agree among themselves as to the amount of their former faith and practices that was to be conserved in the new faith and as to how much of these should be abandoned. The believers at Jerusalem who felt it to be their mission to convert their fellow countrymen continued the faithful observance of the Jewish law and customs.\* St. Peter needed a heavenly vision to teach him that the gospel was destined to break through the confines of the Jewish law. Gradually, by their experience under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the Jewish christians were led to modify and change their conceptions. In the course of time St. Peter advanced to the higher plane of faith, as exhibited in the epistles that bear his name. James, the brother of the Lord, seemed to have been much slower in his progress. There can be no doubt,

\* "The Apostles, after the day of Pentecost, continued to visit the Temple and the Synagogue, and to observe circumcision, the Sabbath and the other customs of the fathers, hoping for the conversion of all Israel, until they were cast out by the Jewish Hierarchy."

*History of the Christian Church, Vol. VI., p. 375.*

DR. PHILLIP SCHAFF.

however, that the conception of the gospel and of its mission, widened and deepened in the minds and hearts of the believers at Jerusalem, including apostles, elders and people, as the events of the time unfolded themselves. But the apostle Paul advanced more rapidly than they all in grasping the full scope and intent of christianity. And for that reason he came into conflict in the earlier years of his labors with the conservative element in the church. He and his co-laborers represented the progressive and aggressive spirit, while the Jewish christians were the embodiment of the conservative spirit. The spirit of St. Paul prevailed. His views and practices became established in the church in general in subsequent ages. The observance of the Jewish law and customs passed entirely away after the apostolic age. The distinctive features of the mother congregation were not retained in the church in after ages. The church became Pauline rather than Petrine or Jacobine. Especially is this the case with the protestant branch of the church in modern times. St. Paul may be said to be preëminently the apostle of Protestantism. "Justification by faith" was the watchword of the Reformation. The principles represented by Peter and James in their early days have prevailed more particularly in the Roman church of all ages. It is true, Jewish ceremonies and customs are not practiced in that communion, but much greater stress is laid on law than on liberty.

But it may be argued that by the admission that the apostles modified and enlarged their conceptions of the practical operations of christianity among the children of men, as they advanced in the christian life and experience, the doctrine of divine inspiration is undermined. We, however, think not. Who will say that they were not led by the Holy Spirit to undergo these modifications of their faith and to change their practices? They would be led by the Spirit only to the extent that they were capable of being led. If some advanced more rapidly in the truth than others, it was because their capacity for the illumination of the Spirit was larger. The Saviour at one time said to His disciples that they were not then able to bear all the revelations that were

to be made. And there can be no doubt that the operations of the Holy Spirit were limited at every stage by the condition of the subjects. We believe in the divine inspiration of the apostles and prophets and holy men of old. However, it is always necessary that we adjust our views of inspiration to the facts in the case. The New Testament Scriptures are full of evidences that establish the fact that the apostles did modify their views, especially in regard to the utility of the Jewish law in the christian household, but we have no difficulty in believing in the real, true divine inspiration of those who were called to be leaders in the church of those days. We might add yet that some good and learned christians hold that Jesus changed His mind and purpose as the work of His ministry progressed. Such a statement may be shocking to the christian sense of some persons. We neither affirm nor deny the proposition. But it may after all be that it is not so much out of harmony with the facts of His life as might be supposed. The consciousness in His soul, which asserted itself in His twelfth year, that He must be about His Father's business never left Him, but, no doubt, grew ever clearer and stronger up to the time when He, on the cross, committed His spirit into the Father's hands. Yet, when it is said that He returned to His parents and grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man, it certainly is meant that He made progress in His inner and outer life, advancing ever from a lower to a higher stage of knowledge and consciousness of His personality and mission. On the same general principle is it wrong to believe that Jesus, the Saviour, knew more when He hung on the cross than He did at His baptism in the river Jordan? Or, must we believe that His own life and experience had no meaning and value for Himself personally? The nature of the answers to these inquiries will depend largely as to whether the emphasis be placed on the human or on the divine nature in the Person of the Son of God made flesh.

### III.

## THE DISTINCTIVELY CHRISTIAN ELEMENTS IN THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

BY REV. H. M. J. KLEIN.

The debate over the Epistle of James, begun already in the Early Church, vigorous in the days of the Reformation, and more involved than ever since the Modern Critical period beginning with Semler, has in the last half-decade been renewed by biblical scholars. No pains have been spared in the effort to throw a brighter light on the vexed problem. This is manifest to any one consulting recent monographs, commentaries on the Epistle, or histories of early Christian literature. From these it is seen that three different positions are now held by scholars in regard to the character of the Epistle, viz.: (1) That it is "a Christian adaptation of a Jewish book, written before the Christian era," containing nothing distinctively Christian, no ideas that go beyond Judaism, a book written by a Jew for Jews. This theory was advanced by Spitta\* of Strassburg and the Frenchman Massebrieau † simultaneously and independently in 1896. (2) That the Epistle contains Christian elements but no Pauline elements, and is, therefore, a pre-Pauline letter. This is the position of Dr. Willibald Beyschlag in his new commentary on "James" in Meyers' Series, 1898. (3) That the Epistle is no letter at all, but a Homily akin to the Clementine Homilies. It contains both Christian and Pauline elements, and is, therefore, a post-Pauline production. The leader of this idea is Harnack.‡

In these notes we will not concern ourselves about the distinctively Pauline or anti-Pauline elements in the Epistle, but con-

\* Spitta's "Zur Geschichte u. Literatur des Urchristentums," Vol. II., now separately published as "Der Brief des Jacobus untersucht."

† In an article entitled "L'Épître de Jacques, est-elle l'œuvre d'un Chrétien?" which appeared in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Paris.

‡ *Altchristliche Litteratur bis Eusebius, der Jacobus Brief*, s. 485-491.



fine ourselves to the question whether there are ideas in the book that go beyond Judaism, whether the atmosphere of it is Jewish or Christian, whether its contents warrant the assertion that it is a book written by a Jew for Jews, or whether there is sufficient internal evidence to compel us to the conclusion that it was written by a Christian for Jews or Christians as the case may be.

Spitta has opened new questions in the James' problem. He has attempted a new solution. Will it stand in the light of the facts? Is the conclusion to which he comes demanded by the data? Before we dare deny that the book was originally strictly Jewish, we ought to know something of this man, his motives and the nature of his arguments. Fredrich Spitta, at one time pastor in Oberwesel and Bonn, was in 1887 appointed professor of theology at Strassburg. He is devout and scholarly, recognized as one of the foremost living authorities on pre-Christian Hellenistic Literature. A mere wave of the hand, a shrug of the shoulder, or a sneer of contempt will not do, in dealing with a man so indefatigable in his search for truth. The Epistle of James is an unsolved problem, and here is one who has earnestly and honestly attempted an entirely new solution. He does this with such a scholarship, gift of combination and tact that even though we do not agree with his conclusions, much can be learned from analysis of his book. A few years ago he astonished the Biblical world by showing the undoubted parallel between much of the Apocalypse and Jewish sources, and now by the same method of parallelism he tries to prove that the Epistle under consideration was written by a Jew, James, to his brethren in the diaspora. His whole exposition of course is colored by this theory. He takes verse after verse in matter, as also partly in form, and shows, or attempts to show, that it is paralleled by contemporaneous Grecian Jewish Literature. The theory is not entirely unreasonable—or it would not call forth recognition and reply from almost every prominent New Testament exegete.\*

\* A work on "James" that would ignore Spitta would be incomplete in our day. Note the recognition given to him in Hasting's *New Bible Dictionary*, under "James"—also by Haupt in "*Studien u. Kritiken*," by Beyachlag. Weiss, Harnack and others.

That a Jewish devotional book should be read with edification by Christians also, especially when retouched so as to give it a Christian flavor, examples of this are not wanting. We have such adaptation of Jewish books by Christians in the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs, the Testament of Abraham, the Sibylline Books, the Apokalypse of Moses, the Fourth Book of Ezra, etc. In the case of the Epistle of James such adaptation, accepting the Jewish origin of it, was necessary in exceedingly few points because the contents dealt with the religious and moral sphere which Judaism and Christianity had in common. Spitta claims that such retouching or adaptation took place at two points, not for the purpose of deception, but for explanatory reasons. They are the two passages in the epistle, and the only two in which the name of Christ occurs, James 2:1 and 1:1. His arguments for suspecting interpolation are as follows:

I. James 2:1 "The faith of our Lord Jesus Christ of glory." He believes the original to have been "the faith of the Lord of glory," and the name of the Christ added as explanatory (*ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*). For, he reasons,\* as all who have ever examined this passage know, it has been a *crux interpretum* for all commentators. Some make "of glory" modify "faith," others make it modify "of our Lord," others "Christ," others "with respect of persons," others the whole phrase, but in most instances the fixed phrase "Lord of glory" (*ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης*) seems to be recognized in this clause. From this premise, the conclusion is drawn that the original reading of the passage was "the faith of the Lord of glory"—glory, referring to a Jewish attribute of God. In the New Testament the expression "the God of glory" occurs in Acts 7:2, or "the Father of glory" in Eph. 1:17, and in the Old Testament are often found the phrases, "the glory of the Lord," "the God of glory," "the king of glory" and in the Book of Enoch "the Lord of glory" is found frequently. For these reasons, many exegetes have translated James 2:1 "The faith of our Lord of glory." But the position of the Greek

\* These arguments are condensed from Spitta's own work, "Der Brief des Jacobus" p. 4-10.

words does not justify this. In addition to this, the fact that in several minuscules the substituted reading *τῇ πίστει τῆς δόξης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* 'I. XP. is found, and that in thirteen translations, as well as in several of the Fathers, *τῆς δόξης* is omitted entirely, shows how long perplexity about the peculiar arrangement of words in this passage has existed. Spitta's solution is that the original was "the Lord of glory" to which *ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* was later added in order to make definite the fact that the same person was meant who is described in I Cor. 2 : 8 "They crucified the Lord of glory." The study of the variation of New Testament texts shows that very often after the word "Lord" an addition or supplement was made of the name of Christ as explanatory. Even in this Epistle, James 5 : 14, after the phrase "in the name of the Lord" the minuscules of various readings have "Jesus" or "Jesus Christ." Similar instances are found in Phil. 4 : 13, Col. 1 : 2, I Thess. 1 : 1, II Thess. 2 : 2.

The connection between James 1 : 27 and 2 : 1 is very close. Mercy toward widow and orphan, and purity are represented as pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father. Immediately thereupon it is said that discrimination in favor of the rich as over against the poor does not conform to the faith of the Lord of glory. Does this not imply the same one who was characterized in 1 : 27 as "God and Father"? What could James have meant by mentioning God the Father as the object of worship, then Jesus Christ the Son, as God of glory, and immediately in 2 : 4 to point to God as He who, as He is the God who protects the orphan, is also the God who protects the poor of this world. Therefore, thinks Spitta, as abrupt as the name of Christ is in the context, so natural would be the idea of the Lord of glory as God the Father.

The First Epistle of Peter is dependent on James. The parallel passages show that the not specifically Christian expressions of James have been given a Christian turn by Peter. One would naturally expect that if a distinctively Christian expression were found in James, it would be taken over into the Epistle of Peter with so much more avidity. But with the expression "The faith

of our Lord Jesus Christ of glory" the case is reversed. James 1:26-2:2 corresponds in many respects with I Peter 1:17-21. A number of words and phrases are alike. Now it is evident that the passage in I Peter 1:17 "And if ye call on Him as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man's work" corresponds to James 2:1 and proves that the Father to whom a pure and undefiled religious service shall be given, is the same before whom there is no respect of persons and whom one can serve acceptably only as according to James 2:1 he also does not regard the outward estates of rich or poor. But this is the Lord of glory and Peter emphasizes the fact in 1:21 when he says that God gave to Christ "glory" (*δοξα*). This He can do only as He possesses that glory and is Lord of glory—even as in Matt. 16:27 "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father." Elsewhere Peter Christianized the thought of James. Here if the expression of James was "The Lord of glory" it was sufficient christianization for Peter to state that God clothed Christ with glory. From these arguments, it is concluded by the Strassburg professor that the words *ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* in James 2:1 were later interpolations for explanatory reasons.

II. The other passage 1:1, "A servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" is not treated as extensively. If the name of Christ is interpolated in one passage, Spitta seems to think the evidence for the interpolation of the other is strengthened. The original was to have been "the servant of God," an expression found in the later Old Testament books at abundant places: I Chron. 6:49, I Esr. 6:12, II Esr. 20:29, Isa. 42:19, Dan. 3:26; 6:20; 9:11. It corresponds to the often used "servant of the Lord." In the New Testament the expression "servant of God" is often used: Acts. 16:17, Tit. 1:1, I Pet. 2:16; also the expression "servant of Jesus Christ": Rom. 1:1, I Cor. 7:22, Gal. 1:10, II Pet. 1:1, Jud. 1, etc. But nowhere is the combination of the two expressions found. Even in Rev. 23:3, when it is said "the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein," there follows the expression, not *their* servants,

but "*his* servants shall do him service." Therefore the phrase "A servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," 1:1 like the phrase in 2:1 is a unicum.

Having disposed of these two manifestly Christian phrases the way to the proof of his proposition, that this Epistle is in no wise superior to pre-Christian Hellenistic Literature lies open. He attempts to show with a wonderful storehouse of parallels—his tact of combining getting the better of his judgment at times—on the one hand that every idea of James has its parallel in some Jewish writing and, on the other hand, that almost every idea of James' has been influencing New Testament writers, Synoptists, I Peter, Pauline Letters, Epistle to Hebrews, etc. While this Strassburg professor has laid emphasis on the Judaistic elements of the Epistle, the Frenchman Massebrieau has laid stress on the absence of the specifically Christian thought in the book. Into his arguments we will not enter here.

Over against all this, what can be said about the distinctive and positive Christian elements in the Epistle? It is true that the name of Christ occurs but twice. It is true that on both occasions the expressions are unique. And yet all of Spitta's arguments, if they prove anything, prove only the *possibility* of interpolation at these points. They do not prove the *actuality* of it—no, not without a tremendous metaphysical leap. They do not even prove the *probability* of such interpolation. For, would a Christian editor have been satisfied with such a slight revision, as the explanatory insertion of the name of Christ into two passages? Would it not require an improbable, yes, almost an impossible James seriously to write a book composed entirely of citations? Would not this James be almost a psychological impossibility? Spitta does prove the uniqueness of the phraseology of James 1:1 and 2:1. But the uniqueness of an expression is not a proof of its spuriousness. Further, we must note that the Christian character of the Epistle does not rise or fall with these two expressions, be they adapted or not. We confess that it would be neither a difficult matter, nor altogether an unreasonable one, if the Epistle had been written by a Jew

James, later to assign it to a Christian known by that name, and to alter 1 : 1 so as to give a more definite characterization of the author, and to retouch 2 : 1 so as to cause it to refer to Christ, even though the latter adaptation would introduce a strange abruptness. And yet in spite of all this, the decision in favor of Spitta's theory could not be made logically until it be proved that the whole contents of the Epistle necessarily attaches itself to a Jewish author, and that nowhere, outside of the two passages above referred to, characteristically positive Christian thought appears. Unless he proves this he would prove only that the Epistle of James has been greatly influenced by Jewish literature.

Is the Epistle of James then entirely independent of positive Christian ideas? Does it not presuppose in some instances at least its readers as Christians? Is not Spitta's conception of Christianity too narrow in that it limits the Christian idea too much to the letters in the name of the Christ? If the name of the Christ is not in the book, is not the spirit of the Christ there? We believe it is and will give our reasons for so believing. As Reuss says, "It is easy to count how often James uses the name of Christ, but it will be found that no one who lives out this Epistle will dishonor that name."

1. The whole *Weltanschauung* of the book has in it something Christian. Its view-point is identical with that of the Sermon on the Mount. The standpoint of the writer, whoever he may be, is never that of a mere moralist. He is always more than a Jewish prophet. His ideal is not the glory of Israel, but the Kingdom (James 2 : 5). The Highest Good is God. The Highest earthly ambition to be "rich in faith" 2 : 5. To place supreme worth on the earthly and the transitory is to fall short of the highest, is to be poor in faith, is doubt toward God. This is the ideality of the Epistle, a height that the Old Testament Books have striven after, but which as a world-idea, as an "ethico-religious foundation of life" is distinctively and positively reached only in the Christian economy. See Matt. 6 : 33 ; 5 : 44-48, etc. In James 2 : 5, there is a reference to the New Testament view-point of the Kingdom as the spiritual goal and ideal



of humanity. "Did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the Kingdom which He promised to them that love Him?" (2: 5). It is true the kingdom-idea is also found in the Old Testament, has its roots there. God is said to be "King of all the earth"; "His Kingdom ruleth over all"; "Thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and Thou art exalted as Head over all." But do these passages not refer rather to the natural universal dominion of God, which is the basis of the moral and the spiritual kingdom paramount in New Testament teachings? Is not the promise given in James 2: 5, primarily a spiritual promise; "rich" not in this world's goods, but "in faith"; heirs not of a natural dominion embracing all objects, persons and events, nor even of a national kingdom bound by ceremonial limitations, but of this ethical kingdom in humanity which was God's end in creation from the first, and which it was the especial mission of Jesus Christ to incarnate and proclaim. In other words, does it not do less violence to legitimate exegesis to refer James 2: 5 to Matt. 5: 3, "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," and to Luke 6: 20, "Blessed are ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of God?" Does not the clause in James 2: 5, "The kingdom which He has promised to them that love Him," refer to the very promise made in these opening sentences of the Sermon on the Mount? Do not the words "to them that love Him" suggest the New Testament idea of the kingdom as an organized life of love in the world with Christ as center.

2. The God-idea in James is Christian. It is the Fatherhood-idea, "our God and Father" 1: 27; "the Lord and Father" 3: 9. It is true, God is called Father at times in Judaism, but only in particular relations. Fatherhood as God-essence is distinctively Christian. Expressions like Psalms 103: 13 where the mercy of God is simply compared to the mercy of a father, and passages like Isaiah 63: 16; 64: 8; I Chron. 29: 10 where God is declared Father, meaning that He has taken a fatherly position to the covenant people in that he created them a covenant people, these passages imply something different from New Testament Father-essence.

sence. When in Deut. 32 : 6 ; Jer. 3 : 4, 19 ; 31 : 9 ; II Macc. 6 : 3, 8 ; Wis. Sol. 2 : 16 ; Sir. 23 : 1, 4 ; etc. God is called father of Israel and of the Israelites, meaning in many of these instances only that in certain things Jehovah stands in the relation of father, as a loving Provider for example—all this is something quite different from the New Testament characteristic description of God, “*θεός καὶ πατήρ*”—Fatherhood, his one all-embracing attribute by virtue of which he takes us into the communion of his supernatural life through Christ. It does not prove anything simply to show that the word *πατήρ* was used in Judaism. The nearest logical conclusion is that the formulas “God and Father” 1 : 27 ; “the Lord and Father” 3 : 9 spring out of the economy of which they are characteristic, namely, the Christian.

3. The Christian New-Birth idea is found in the Epistle. James 1 : 18, “Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures.” Spitta claims that this passage refers to the first creation, and that “first-fruits” (*ἀπαρχή*) means “first in honor” and not “first in time.” True, the word *ἀπαρχή* can be so used, and is so used by Euripides in *Orestes* 96,\* according to the interpretation of the Scholastics. The Old Testament word *rêshûth* corresponding to the *ἀπαρχή* of the Septuagint may likewise mean both “first in excellence” and “first in time.” Therefore, the word “first fruits” is not, in itself considered, against referring this passage to the first creation. But such reference to natural creation is excluded by the first part of the verse. The word “truth” as here used is distinctively Christian. The phrase “word of truth” occurs, it is true, in Psa. 119 : 43, 160, but this does not prove that the same expression in James refers to the creative word of Genesis. Here it means a word whose content is truth. What is the use of the Genitive if natural creation is meant? What reason is there at all for *ἀληθείας*. Verse 17 says that “every good gift and every perfect boon is from above.” Now if verse 18 refers

\*Schol. ad Eur. Or. 96, ἀπαρχὴ ἐλλέγετο οὐ μόνον τὸ πρῶτον τῇ τάξει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον τῇ τιμῇ.

to the first creation then every creation came through this word of God, why emphasize to mankind directly afterwards that he was created by the word of truth. Further, "the first fruits of his creatures" in this verse does not mean the dominion of man over other creatures. For the indefinite *τινα* following *ἀπαρχήν* shows that the author is thinking of "first fruits" figuratively and has in mind the Old Testament first-born sacrifice. If this be true then the passage cannot refer to the relation of man to other creatures, for the idea of sacrifice involves the relation of man to God. But if we interpret the sentence in the light of the Christian new-birth idea, it becomes clear. The "word of truth," the Gospel that has the eternal truth as its content, is the bearing power. Truth in the Christian sense, *ἀληθεια*, that which is revealed as the only eternal objective reality, is the means to another birth. This idea, found throughout the whole New Testament, is distinctive of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. In so far then as the readers in the Epistle are the first generation of those "brought forth by the word of truth" they are in a sense (*τις*) first fruits, i. e., they are the earnest of the fact that the whole world shall be born anew of God. With this interpretation of the verse notice the beautifully logical Christian order of thought in the passage. Every gift which has the mark of goodness comes from God. In the giving of good gifts there is no variableness nor shadow of turning in God. The highest gift is that which is especially imparted to the readers, namely, God has separated them from all others in that He gave them first the "word of truth"; and through it made them new creatures; all this only out of His free will. Understood in this light, it seems impossible to think of verse 18 as other than consciously Christian for Christian readers.\*

4. There is a Christian idea in James 2:7, "Do not they blaspheme the honourable name by the which ye are called?"

Does not this mean that the readers are baptized into the name of Christ? It is true that this mode of expression often occurs

\*For fuller discussion of this verse, see *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1896, article by Haupt.

in the Old Testament, referring to the name of Jahve, II Chron. 7:14, Isa. 43:7, 63:19, Jer. 7:10, Dan. 9:18, Amos 9:12, etc. But this Old Testament meaning will not suit in the context of James 2:7. If the rich oppressors of the readers are Jews, as we believe, they bring disgrace through their action not upon the Jahve name that is given to the readers, or we would expect the phrase "the name by the which *they* are called" or "the name by the which *we* are called." The use of the second person, "*ye*" presupposes that the readers belong to a different communion from their brethren. Are the oppressors the rich Jews, then the readers, here referred to can only be christians on whom in baptism another name was laid, the *καλὸν ὄνομα*, the name of Christ.

5. In James 2:14 ff, we have a prominence of the faith-idea that could have arisen only in the Christian era. True, the Old Testament like the book of James does lay emphasis on the fact that God shall render to every man according to his works. True, Judaism does have a faith-idea of its own. And yet "faith" in its active sense can barely be accounted an Old Testament term. The problem of a conflict between the justifying power of faith and works did not arise. Only in the atmosphere of the new Covenant, only in the economy born of the One who said, "According to your faith be it unto you," did this faith-idea receive so much prominence as to raise the question whether it alone was sufficient for justification.

6. The New Testament idea of Christ's second coming is in this Epistle. James 5:7, 8, 9, "Be patient therefore, brethren, until the coming of the Lord. \* \* \* Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord is at hand. Murmur not, brethren, one against another, that ye be not judged: behold, the judge standeth before the doors." The writer of such words must have been familiar with the great Eschatological Discourse of Christ recorded in Matt. 24 and 25. Spitta tells us that the phrase "The coming of the Lord" as found in James refers not to the future return from heaven of Jesus, but to the judgment of God. He calls our attention to the phrase "until the coming of the God of righteousness" found in the Testament

of Jude c. 22 ; also to Joel 2 : 1 "The day of the Lord is at hand"; and further claims that James in this passage is in full accord with the prophetic and apocalyptic writings of Enoch, 4 Ezra, Apoc. Baruch, etc. For the figure of the Judge standing before the door we are referred to Isa. 26 : 20 ff. And yet in spite of these parallels, the most direct meaning of the passage is undeniably the universal Apostolic conception of the Parousia, as the future visible return from heaven of Jesus, the Messiah, to raise the dead, hold the last judgment and set up formally and gloriously the Kingdom of God. To denote this reappearance of the Christ, the phrase "The coming of the Lord" is constantly used. I Th. 3 : 13, 4 : 15, 5 : 23, II Th. 2 : 1, II Peter 3 : 4. This is the consolation that the writer holds out to the poor, oppressed persecuted Christians addressed in the Epistle. They are to be patient and not to murmur, for the judge is none other than the Lord whose coming is near. In 5 : 3 the "last days" are mentioned. In 5 : 9 the Judge is before the doors. To what can this figure, in the days of persecution, refer more appropriately than to that prophecy of the Son of Man. "Even so ye also, when ye see all these things, know ye that he is nigh, even at the doors" Matt. 24 : 33.

7. The Epistle is full of Christ's own teaching. While nothing is mentioned of the Person of Christ, of his Life, Death or Resurrection, yet there is no New Testament Epistle that is in such evident harmony with his Teaching, especially with the Sermon on the Mount. It is not by ceaselessly crying "Lord," "Lord," that James proves himself a loyal servant to his Master, but by teaching others to practice the things which Christ said. It is the words of Christ upon which he dwells rather than upon the Name and the Person of Christ. Here are some parallels to prove this assertion :

James 1 : 4. And let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing.

Matt. 5 : 48. Ye, therefore, shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

James 1:5. But if any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.

James 1:17. Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning.

James 1:6. But let him ask in faith, nothing doubting:

James 1:9. But let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate: and the rich, in that he is made low:

James 1:21. Receive with meekness the implanted word, which is able to save your souls.

James 1:22. But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own selves.

James 1:25. But he that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth, but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing.

Matt. 7:7. Ask and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you.

Matt. 7:11. If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him?

Matt. 21:21, 23. "If ye have faith and doubt not" \* \* \* And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive. See also Mark 11:23, 24.

Matt. 5:3, 5. Blessed are the poor in spirit: Blessed are the meek:

Matt. 13. Parable of Sower.

Matt. 7:26. And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man.

John 13:17. If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them.



James 2: 5. Hearken, my beloved brethren; did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him?

James 2: 8. Howbeit if ye fulfil the royal law, according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well:

James 2: 13. For judgment is without mercy to him that hath shewed no mercy: mercy glorieth against judgment.

James 2: 14 to 3: 18. Emptiness of Faith without works.

James 3: 18. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace for them that make peace.

James 5: 12. But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; that ye fall not under judgment.

James 4: 7. Resist the devil and he will flee from you.

Luke 6: 20. Blessed are ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of God.

Matt. 22: 36 ff. Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Thou shalt love the Lord thy God. \* \* \* Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Mk. 12: 28 ff. Luke 10: 26-28. Do this and thou shalt live.

Matt. 5: 7. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

Matt. 18: 23-35. A certain king made a reckoning with his servants, etc.

Matt. 7: 17-21. Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

Matt. 5: 9. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God.

Matt. 5: 34-37. But I say unto you, swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet; \* \* \*. But let your speech be, yea, yea; nay, nay; and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one.

Matt. 4. Temptation of Jesus.

Compare also James 4:4 with Matt. 6:24; James 4:9 with Luke 6:25; James 4:10 with Luke 18:14; James 4:12 with Matt. 7:1; James 5:1 with Luke 6:24; James 3:12 with Matt. 7:16; James 3:2-12 with Matt. 12:36; James 5:2, 3 with Matt. 6:19; James 5:9 with Matt. 24 and 25; James 5:10 with Matt. 5:12.

Certainly, these passages are abundant enough and similar enough to prove that there is great harmony between James and the Synoptics. Now, it is true that in some instances the passages common to both James and the Synoptics may be referred back to Jewish literature. The difficulty is increased by the fact that Christ in great part fell in with the formal thought of the Jews. While we are convinced that the thoughts of Christ in contents, even in cases of verbal similarity, were different from the purely Jewish thoughts of pre-Christian days, yet the more our knowledge of Jewish literature increases, the more we are astonished at the amount of similarity in form between it and the words of Christ. Therefore, it may be granted that in those cases where James has parallels in Jewish literature as well as in the Synoptics, there is a possibility that both were influenced by that literature. But the similarity of words in James and Christ is not the main question. Neither is the repetition of the name of Jesus in the book the determining factor. The common circle of thought in which James and Jesus move is above all things else, above all details and parallels, the convincing fact to us that the writer of this Epistle was one who lived in a higher atmosphere than that of Judaism. The whole tone and spirit and language of the Epistle are characteristic of one who holds as the dearest treasure of his heart and who practices in his everyday life and conduct "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory."

Where is a writing of Judaism, and we have a high regard for the beauty, power and purity of Jewish Hellenistic Literature, but where is a pre-Christian writing that can compare with James; that not only contains individual thoughts which the Christian can appropriate; that not only is so free from earthly

elements, but that moves so entirely on the vantage ground of New Testament ethical truth? Harnack well says "the best argument against the Jewish authorship of James is *what the Epistle does not contain*. The earthly elements of Judaism are not present." The book undoubtedly was written by one who had a comprehensive knowledge of Grecian-Jewish Literature, probably a Jewish Christian who grew up in the Diaspora, and who lived in the midst of Greek culture as the richness and choice of diction compel us to believe. Whoever he may have been, whether the brother of our Lord or some other James, one thing is certain. The total ethical height of the book is to be accounted for only as the author was under the power of the moral conception of Jesus. The perfect series of moral and religious elements in the Epistle will not be explained except in the light of the Christ.

#### IV.

### HORACE BUSHNELL, PREACHER AND THEOLOGIAN.\*

BY REV. C. CLEVER, D.D.

The Christian public is to be congratulated, that the *Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell*, edited so faithfully by his daughter, and published by the Harpers, soon after his death, is supplemented by the scholarly life by Dr. T. T. Munger. In the former, the theologian and teacher occupies an equal space, with the description of the family of the thoughtful giant. The latter is a successful attempt, by one capable in every way, for the delicate task, to show the clear thinker and powerful preacher, moving along a way ever expanding into the fuller vision and the clearer day. The author is a pupil of Bushnell, in the very best sense of the word, in heartiest sympathy with the direction given to theological thinking in America by his great teacher, and possessing the very literary and spiritual qualifications that fitted him for this labor of love. To any one who has not the time to study the fifteen volumes, that issued from his facile pen, and the large number of pamphlets, Munger's book will give a very clear idea of what Bushnell was and what he taught. It will be a great surprise, to the already large crowd of appreciative admirers of the eminent divine, if a careful reading of Munger will not awaken such an appetite, that the greater portion of the books, at least, will be purchased and read. It looks as if there would be a revival of interest in those thoughts which proved so fructifying in the earlier portion of

\* *Horace Bushnell, Preacher and Theologian*, by T. T. Munger (Scribner's, 1899), *Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell* by his daughter, Mary Bushnell Chaney (Harpers, 1880), *Fisher's History of Christian Doctrine* (Scribner's, 1896), and the following of Bushnell's works: *Christian Nurture*, *Nature and the Supernatural*, *The Vicarious Sacrifice Grounded in Principles Interpreted by Human Analogies*, *Forgiveness and Law and Building Eras*, etc.

the latter half of the century. It is more than probable, that when men seem to be failing to grasp the supernatural in such a way as to form the highest type of character, that Bushnell has a message that this generation would do well to heed.

Horace Bushnell was born in Litchfield, Connecticut, April 14, 1802; graduated at Yale College in 1827; was tutor from 1829-1831. After having studied law, and shown a capacity for journalism, he turned his attention to theology. He became pastor of the North Church in Hartford, Conn., in 1833, and for 26 years administered to a people who never wavered in their devotion to their beloved leader. He died on February 17, 1876.

Bushnell was born in a small town where the culture of the city, and the exhilarating influences of the country were combined. His lot was cast in a home where religion was an affair of every day life, and where the common duties of a country household were made resplendent under the glow of a genuine piety. At first it seemed as if his life would spend itself in honest toil among home-spun people. In the rush of conflict, when he found himself antagonized on every side, there is sometimes almost a sigh, that such might have been the will of God. When we have given us a picture of his home life, of his parents, and of the heavenliness that pervaded everybody and everything in the home, we can understand the drift of Christian culture. Of his mother he writes "She was the only person I have known in the close intimacy of years who never did an inconsiderate, imprudent or in any way excessive thing, that required to be afterwards mended." A younger brother writes of the religious atmosphere of the home as follows: "He was born in a household where religion was no occasional and nominal thing, no irksome restraint nor unwelcome visitor, but a constant atmosphere, a commanding but genial presence." The beautiful surroundings of the old homestead exercised a commanding influence upon the development of his thought and character. If Bushnell would have been born amid the smoke and confusion of one of our metropolitan cities, it is just possible that Nature and the Supernatural would never have seen the light of day. His profound

appreciation of the analogies in nature, expressed in this treatise which in germ lay hid in his mind, when he started upon his career, had been imbibed in boyhood and early manhood from the familiar haunts which he frequented. To the close of his life he kept up communication with the world around about him. He heard what the day had to say unto the day. He listened for the clearer knowledge that the stars would communicate to a hungering and thirsting spirit.

Here also, in communion with nature and the home-spun life of New England, he attained an independency which never forsook him. He followed his conclusions wherever they might lead. It never occurred to him that the utterance of a truth should depend upon the feelings of his next-door neighbor. In a little gem of autobiography he says: "I have never been a great agitator, never pulled the wire to get the will of man, never did a politic thing. It was not for this reason, but because I was looked upon as a singularity—not exactly sane, perhaps, in many things—that I was almost never a president or vice-president of any society, and almost never on a committee."

After he had entered college he fell under a spell of great doubt. The theological controversies, as he saw them, forced men to struggle for victory over an enemy rather than for the triumph of the truth. Then the reflux wave of those influences which were felt all the round world from the French Revolution caught Bushnell. He detested the controversies with a hatred that made him unwilling to be numbered among the intellectual companions of such men. For the time being his mind turned toward literary work, and finally to the Law. But, underneath all this, there was such an undertow of family religion that must make itself felt, sooner or later, against the most gigantic and destructive influences of unbelief.

While a tutor at Yale there was a wave of revivalism swept through the college. Many young men remained indifferent, because their leader, so much loved, was in the same state of mind and heart. The thing at last became overpowering to the manly but sensitive soul of Bushnell. The spirit moved



him and he surrendered to the standard of the cross. Though he was ready to enter upon his legal career; and a prominent New York daily opened its doors bidding him to take a seat, as leader of its staff of contributors, he determined upon a theological course. He experienced a great change. He met his doubts and slew them. When wearied with the speculations of theology, he found that his heart could love God, and that God loved him; He said in a daily meeting of his fellow tutors "O men what shall I do with these arrant doubts I have been nursing for years? When the preacher touches the Trinity, and when logic shatters it all to pieces, I am all at the four winds. But I am glad I have a heart as well as a head. My heart wants the Father; my heart wants the Son; my heart wants the Holy Ghost—and one just as much as the other. My heart says the Bible has a Trinity for me, and I mean to hold by my heart. I am glad a man can do it, when there is no other mooring." Here you have in a nutshell the whole of Bushnell's theological position. He believed with Neander that the heart makes the theologian. His faith in freedom, and the supernatural element in man, which expressed itself in this way, he felt would never play false with him. When he found freedom working in man, and upon the natural world, round about him, he had such unwavering faith in the process, that he became perilously near being a Pantheist. He now started upon a theological career that was consistent throughout, with but rare exceptions.

At this time he fell under the influence of Schleiermacher, and still more under the direct influence of Coleridge. "This Christian philosopher," to use Hare's words in the dedication to Coleridge of the sermons on the Mission of the Comforter, "who, through dark and winding paths of speculation, was led to the light, in order that others, by his guidance, might reach that light without passing through the darkness" became an inspiration to Bushnell. He does not seem to have read much besides the *Aids to Reflection*, but these seem to have become a *vade mecum* for him. They stimulated him. A few sentences would arouse his mind, and start it off upon a line of thought which

would be embodied in a book, or in one of those matchless sermons, that preëmpted both text and theme, so far as subsequent students were concerned.

In 1847 appeared the first, and, in many respects, the best book prepared by Bushnell. It was entitled "Christian Culture."\* It has been introduced within the last three or four years, as a text-book, into one of our most prominent theological seminaries. Revivalism, since the days of Edwards, had swept everything before it. The rights of children, in covenant relationship, had been trampled under foot. The organic relation, existing in the household, had been wholly disregarded. The atomic theory of life had gone to seed. Individualism had run mad. A large and important segment of human life had been given over to the devil. The Baptist Church had battened upon the errors of Congregationalism, and the truths, hitherto so lovingly held by the fathers, had been set at naught. He contended that it was the design of Providence that religious character should be transmitted from parent to child. If evil could be transmitted, he argued, why should not the good come down along the same heaven-ordained streams? Children should be expected to grow up into Jesus Christ in all things. Parents should feel that from the very beginning they should train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Such sentiments would produce a type of family life that would as surely make Christians, as the sunshine and rainfall make flowers grow on the hillside.

The main reliance of the church and home had been revivals. The Kingdom of God thus advanced by fits and starts. All this was horrible to Bushnell. He combatted it with the same energy that Dr. Nevin did the same unchurchly spirit in the Reformed Church and about at the same time.

The appearance of the book raised a tempest. Instead of finding a warmth, which would make the home life blossom as the rose, the critics insisted that he made religion simply a natural process. There seemed to be no room for the energizing of the

\* Munger says Dr. J. W. Nevin wrote the ablest and most sympathetic review of this book when it appeared in 1847.

Holy Ghost. This was found later on, however, to apply rather to expressions of the author than to the intent of the book. "He postulated an operation of grace, and an operation as immediate as is presupposed in the prevailing creed, in the case of adult conversion." It seems strange that such truths a half century ago should have closed the pulpits of the one half of the American church to this high spirited champion of children. This theological Eugene Field had to wait a long time before a Christian public was ready to say, Thou art right O prophet of God ; O seer, who endured as seeing Him who is invisible, when thou didst so chivalrously espouse the cause of consecrated childhood.

The next volume was entitled *God in Christ*, consisting of three lectures delivered at New Haven, Cambridge and Andover, preceded by a dissertation on *Language*.

In the latter, together with an essay contributed to *Hours at Home* in 1869, entitled *Our Gospel a Gift to the Imagination*, we have something which may be regarded as Bushnell's distinctive contribution to Modern Religious Thought. Comparing these two remarkable papers, and remembering that twenty years of intense activity intervene, we will be struck by their similarity. His theory, which conditioned all his thinking, stood him in splendid stead ; for he found no reason to materially modify it. In these two essays, he contends that all language is symbolical. When a thought becomes bound in theological definition, it becomes finite. The bird that soars and sings in the broad air of heaven and ascends to God, has become caged in a murky room, where the air is stifled with smoke and foulness. Where men dogmatized and crystalized thought, into formulas, it could no longer look beyond the boundaries of time, and the world. Inasmuch as "language is made up of symbols, it is of necessity inaccurate, so that theological definitions are metaphors, and creeds are in reality poems" (Fisher). Here it was that Bushnell was constantly being misunderstood. He accepted as parable what the generality accepted as fact. When theology gave itself to making creeds or defining terms, it no longer read the inner sense, or

received the inner contents of words ; for him there could scarcely be a theology, in the common acceptation of that term. Yet in one of his letters, he criticizes the unitarianism of his day, because it is like an egg without a shell. "The views of language and interpretation I have here offered suggest the very great difficulty, if not impossibility, of mental science and religious dogmatism. In all such cases or attempted uses, the effort is to make language answer a purpose that is against its nature. The winged words are required to serve as beasts of burden ; or, what is better, to forget their poetic life as messengers of the air, and stand still, fixed upon the ground, as wooden statues of truth."

And now having set forth his view of language as the expression of thought under this particular form, he proceeds with the discussion of the Logos as the revelation of the Father. His book was born out of his own experience of the soul's utmost need. "It was a year of great experiences great thoughts, great labors." The death of his child, five years before, had not ceased to bear fruit in the revelations of the Fatherhood of God. "He took my son to his own fatherly bosom, and revealed in my bosom the same expectation and faith of his own eternal son."

It was a book, strange as it may seem, coming forth from a heart chastened in holiest inspiration, which caused so much opposition. It would seem as if he now leaned on Schliermacher with almost his whole weight, when interpreting his vision for the world. He had reached a crisis. On an early morning in February, 1848, his wife awoke to hear that the light they had waited for more than they that watch for the morning, had risen indeed. She asked, what have you seen ? He replied, the Gospel. "It had come to him not as a logical deduction, as a dogmatic definition, as the result of much thought and study, but as a revelation." He felt the mind of God. He had dreamed dreams and seen visions. He was lifted up in the spirit, and heard the Eternal speaking to his soul. It would seem as if an interpretation of the revelation of the Father in the Son, under such influences, should be well nigh perfect. But Dörner says, "He regards Christ Apollinarily, as destitute of human soul, as

a union of God and man, whose purpose is to humanify the idea of God, and thus to express or communicate God." The Trinity for him becomes a method of revelation. It is charged against him that he revived Sabellianism under a form that did not differ materially from Patripassianism. There are expressions in the book that should satisfy the most ardent supporter of Nicene Christology, but the general trend of the book is not satisfactory to the generally received Trinitarian theology. It seemed somewhat unsatisfactory to Bushnell himself, and he approached more nearly the Trinitarian theology in an article in the *New Englander* in 1854, entitled *The Christian Trinity a Practical Truth*. Here he justified some of the criticisms, and showed a decided tendency to accept the so-called orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. He says "On a careful study of the creed prepared by this Council (the Nicene), as interpreted by the writings of Athanasius in defence of it, I feel obliged to confess that I had not sufficiently conceived its import or the title it has to respect as a Christian document."

In 1858 appeared two volumes from Bushnell's busy mind. He seemed to defy a weak body to interfere with an active, earnest mind. For while he was running hither and thither, seeking for restoration to health, and finding none, he was thinking those great thoughts, the expression of which has made him such an acceptable leader for troubled minds. The first was a volume of sermons on *The New Life*, and the second his most celebrated book *Nature and the Supernatural*. He attributes the impulse to write this volume to Coleridge. It was reviewed by Dr. Nevin, in the *Mercersburg Review*, April, 1859. He called it a truly interesting and timely book and credited the author with most careful thought and study upon a theme which must always be of intense interest to the earnest thinker. Critics found fault from both sides. One insisted that he had demolished nature, as a force in the development of life, and the other that the supernatural had been so completely naturalized that there was no longer a necessity for a transcendent God. The author states his purpose as follows: "To find a legitimate place

for the supernatural in the system of God, and show it as a necessary part of the divine system itself." "The world was made to include Christianity; under that becomes a proper and complete frame of order; to that crystallizes, in all its appointments, events and experiences; in that has the design or final cause revealed by which all its distribution, laws and historic changes are determined and systematized."

The author insists that the supernatural does not suspend the laws of nature, and that man is a supernatural being. He acts in the sphere of freedom upon the chain of nature's causes, without suspending a single law; by combinations, and the exercise of will, performs what is a miracle. The natural and supernatural constitute the one system of God, the former subordinated to the latter; man in this system occupies a place in the supernatural, by virtue of his personality and will. The object of the book was to assert the power of the supernatural, under the form of divine immanence, immediately transforming world powers without violating natural law. It was not so much an argument for miracles but for the supernatural. Bushnell felt that this was his greatest contribution to the thought of the world. He found no occasion to modify in later productions the arguments upon which he had grounded his conclusions. He felt, after this, that he had reached a point where he could go on with profounder studies of the problems presented by Christ and His redemption. On New Year's day following the publication of *Nature and the Supernatural* he wrote, "I think the day is at hand when something can be done for a better conception of Christ. Here is the great field left that I wait for grace and health to occupy." That most popular of all Bushnell's writings, the *Character of Christ Forbidding His Classification among Men*, appeared in this volume, and was in some sense a prophecy of events that were to follow.

The next great effort was his volume *The Vicarious Sacrifice*. He called it, in a letter to a friend, my great subject. He spent more time upon these volumes than on any others. He was working under a sense of a revelation. He felt that he had a



truth which had been dimly intimated from Anselm onward, but had never been expounded from the heart instead of the head. "The sacrifice and cross of Christ are represented as the simple duty of Christ, and not any superlative, optional kind of good, outside of all the common principles of virtue. It is not goodness over good, and yielding a surplus of merit, in that manner for-us, but it is only just as good as it ought to be—a model in that view for us, and a power if we can suffer it, of ingenerated life in us." He was not working thus alone. Campbell, Maurice and John Young, in England, had advanced theories resembling Bushnell's in many particulars. It was, however, needed. There had been too little of the moral side of the atonement presented in the theories advocated by the schools. Bushnell felt in his great loving heart the need of an atonement. He found no credal formulæ that would fill the void. In casting about for something corresponding to what he felt, he found it naturally in a moral view of the atonement. When chided by his critics that he did despite to the Gospel record, he replied with an outburst of honest deprecation against the smallest turning aside from the plain declaration of God's word. He found later on that he had not succeeded in preventing the critics from discovering a contradiction between his reasoning, or rather heart imaginings, and God's word. This led to a modification of his view in a volume entitled *Forgiveness and Law*. It is a fine instance of the delicate texture of his intellectual nature and downright honesty, that he could come before the public with a frank avowal of a modification of his former opinion. He courted criticism, and was ever ready for such modifications of former conclusions, as could reasonably be shown, to be the result of false premises. In the former treatise he set forth the truth, that should be emphasized, but not at the expense of another, that there was a renewing influence upon character which flows out from Christ and from His sympathy, which transforms men. There was here a want of a sense of the guilt and depravity of sin. The supernatural in the death of Christ had nothing to do with the forgiveness of sin. The old theology asserted that Christ died for sin, Bushnell said Christ's

death was simply a factor in His life, which, when He had met it, proved His sympathy for men, and thus aroused in them a sympathy for God.

In Forgiveness and Law there was apparently new light upon the problem. Sin had assumed a somewhat murkier hue. "He had caught sight of a meaning and reality in propitiation which he had not discerned before. It had struck him that in all cases of heavy grievance, even though there is a peaceable wish and intent, it is psychologically impossible to quiet the resentful, retributive impulse inherent in one's own conscience, save by undertaking some work involving loss and suffering in behalf of the offender" (Fisher p. 43).

But our time as well as your patience have long since been exhausted. There is enough left to gratify the ambition of most any life. Those magnificent sermons—*The New Life, Christ and His Salvation—The Sermons on Living Subjects*—those essays *Building Eras*, every one of which is a gem—*Moral Uses of Dark Things and Work and Play* would halo any name in American church history. Some of these would form a foundation for a treatise, that would, under the magic touch of Bushnell's heart and mind, have taken its place side by side with *Nature and the Supernatural*. Some of his sermons would have immortalized him, if he would have done nothing else. These sermons, says Munger, "will live on in the world of literature, along with those of Bishop Butler and Mozley and Newman; with hardly less weight of matter, and with even deeper insight into the ways of the spirit, both of God and man." There is a necromancy about his subjects that must have captured an audience of earnest and thoughtful Christians, and caused unbelievers to consider well before taking another step in opposition to the truth of God. There are texts that will ever be associated with Bushnell's name. He has made them his own. They are associated with his ideas of truth, and will be for many generations to come, and it may be for ever.

His essays have not the literary finish of some of the classics of this kind of literature; but for unction, vigor of thought,

imagination, and soul-stirring aspirations, occupy a place peculiarly their own. They are the result of the heart and mind of a great man, whose one desire was to find the truth and then be ever ready to pass it on to those who are still in need of the everlasting light.

He founded no school of thought. He had no patience with any such procedure. Whatever truth would become power must be seen and felt. It could not be accepted simply in formulas and creeds. In the degree that every man becomes a seer, does he come into living touch with the infinite; and is transformed into the image of Him who is the image of the invisible God. "The peculiarity of Bushnell's preaching was that it was vision, it was pure insight; it changed your point of view, you were another man." The religion that he believed in drove him to be interested in all that was going to make up of progress. Wherever he went, he became a power for good. He was one of the great spiritual forces of this century. He was a public spirited citizen. He threw himself with as much energy into the effort to secure a park for Hartford, and a beautiful situation for its court house, as for the preparation of one of his celebrated books. When the dark shadows of the civil war hung over all the extended plains of the realm, his hopefulness cheered many an anxious heart, upon which rested the grave responsibilities of guiding the ship of state, staggering on through blood and slaughter to a heaven-destined haven. He impressed the stamp of his character upon the city in which he lived and upon the borders upon which his foot trod; he felt that no man had caught the true spirit of Christ who could not put his hand to any plow that was set to turn a new furrow in any field into which the budding seed of the century could be planted.

In character he was one of the best types of manhood that America has been able to produce. As a preacher, in his line, he has no equal, much less a superior. As a theologian he is not by any means the safest guide, but for heart and life he is the most pious of them all. As a writer he, like his master Coleridge, will always be suggestive to younger minds; and even the

older ones, who, are in danger of becoming ratty, by taking a good dip into Bushnell, will find truth put into a new view, from which new vistas, hitherto apparently invisible, will be descried with perfect ease. May we not hope that Munger's life of this truly great man will call the attention of a generation that has grown up since he swayed such a mighty sceptre, to the truth which he discovered, and to the power of heart-life derived from his teachings, for the transformation of character from the earthly to the heavenly, from the human to the divine.

## V.

### THE CENTRALIZATION OF JEHOVAH WORSHIP IN ISRAEL.

BY REV. G. W. STIBITZ, PH.D.

The long and tedious process by which the Children of Israel learned their divinely assigned lesson "that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship" (John 4 : 20), furnishes the modern critics of the Old Testament history one of their most forcible arguments in support of the theory of the late origin of the "middle books" and Deuteronomy. Israel seems at first to have worshipped where he listed (Deut. 12 ; 8). This God forbade and commanded that when they had crossed the Jordan, and settled down in their God-given land, they should worship Him at the place which He himself should choose to put his name there. Not until the time of Josiah, the last quarter of the seventh century, B. C., did this become an accomplished fact in their history. In the interpretation of this interesting process the modern school of critics, as is usually the case, simply turns the accepted view upside-down. This instance is given to the readers of the REVIEW because it seems rather cogent and thus teaches us that the views of these men are based on a study of the text and history which must be met not by prejudice but by counter scripture study. As we can only meet rationalism by being more rational, so we can only meet "higher criticism" by being still more highly critical. But on the other hand, to the calm and sober student of the Bible, the arguments for the modern views seem more baffling than convincing. Their ship looks sound and the company is grand to behold, but many of us still feel an unwillingness to venture on so long a journey in so specious a contrivance.

The claim is made that worship in various localities was an approved form of Jehovah cultus down to the time of Josiah when

the prophets put the book of Deuteronomy, with its prohibition of local shrines (ch. 12), into the hands of that king, and he, believing it to be from Moses, though composed for this occasion by the king's contemporaries, carried out the very letter of its precepts and exterminated all worship in high places and on altars. For a fuller statement of this view the reader is referred to the article on *Höhendienst*, by Wolf Baudissin, in Herzog's *Encyclopädie*, 2nd Edition, Vol. VI., pages 185-193. The following is the argument in substance:

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob worshipped at Hebron, Shechem and Beersheba. Near Bethel Abraham built an altar unto the Lord (Gen 12 : 8 ; 13 : 4). On Mt. Moriah he sacrificed the substitute for Isaac (Gen. 22). Jacob offered a sacrifice in the mountain of Gilead (Gen. 31 : 54), and before he left his native land he had made of his stony pillow a Bethel or house of God (Gen. 28 : 20). Even Moses built an altar after his victory over the Amelekites (Ex. 17 : 15), and commanded Joshua to build an altar unto the Lord in Mt. Ebal (Deut. 27 : 5-7), which commandment Joshua (8 : 30 ff) carried out, although the ark and sanctuary were thirty miles away at Gilgal.

During the period of the Judges God says to Gideon, "Build an altar unto the Lord thy God \* \* \* and offer a burnt offering" (Judges 6 : 25). In the tribe of Dan, Manoah and Zorah offer a sacrifice unto the Lord upon a rock (Judges 13 : 19). At Bochim "they sacrificed unto the Lord" (Judges 2 : 5). In Samuel's time there was a high place near Gibeah. These places are all mentioned without a note of disapproval, if not with praise as in the case of the patriarchs. It seems even approvingly recorded of Saul that "he built an altar unto the Lord" (I Sam. 14 : 35), where it is implied that he built more besides.

Samuel the zealous opponent of all idol worship still had his sanctuary at Mizpeh where he drew water and poured it out *before the Lord*, and offered a whole burnt offering unto the Lord (I Sam. 7 : 5-9) and cast lot for the new king (I Sam. 10 : 19-23). In Ramah under Samuel's directions the people had a sacrifice in a high place (I Sam. 9 : 12). Here also he had built



an altar (7:11). With Jesse's family at Bethlehem, he offered a sacrifice (I Sam. 16) and was going to sacrifice at Gilgal (I Sam. 10:8). If the books of Deuteronomy (chap. 12) and Leviticus (17:8, 9) had been written in the time of Moses, how was it possible for a man of Samuel's faithfulness toward God and his law to transgress the commandment of one central sanctuary so clearly given by Moses and so warmly defended in the times of Joshua, as in the incident of the altar built by the transjordanic tribes (Josh. 22).

Even in the time of David there was a customary place of worship on the Mt. of Olives (II Sam. 15:32 R. V. margin) and on the threshing floor of Araunah David, at the command of the prophet Gad, built an altar and offered a sacrifice unto the Lord (II Sam. 24:18, 25). According to (II Sam. 5:3, and 15:7, 8), there was a sanctuary at Hebron, as the expression "before the Lord" is generally understood. Of Solomon it is said (I Kings 3:2, 3), that "he sacrificed and burnt incense on the high places," and likewise the people in his time "because there was no house built for the name of the Lord until those days."

The prophet Elijah complains to God (I Kings 19:10) "the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altar." It appears strange that Elijah should lament the breaking down of altars, if he knew of the prohibition concerning them. Likewise is it strange that the good king Joash, during the regency of so faithful a high priest as Jehoiada should not even attempt to remove so illegal a worship as that of the high-places (II Kings 12:3). According to the Book of Kings there was no effort made on the part of even the good Kings of Judah to remove altars and high-places in Judah, on the contrary the statement is often made that these unlawful places remained.

But when we come to the time of Hezekiah, when these many places of worship had become the shrines, not of Jehovah but of Baal, then the prophets took a stand against their very existence, as being purely idolatrous in their influence. If Jehovah was to be worshipped at all he must be worshipped at one authorized place, viz., at Jerusalem. Under the influence of the prophets,

Hezekiah attempted to remove high-places and altars with limited success. The fearful influence for evil exerted by Manasseh made the prophets, especially Jeremiah, a determined opponent of the sacred localities. When therefore the young King Josiah came on the throne, the prophets influenced him and gave him a copy of the book, composed by one of them, perhaps Jeremiah, and in order to wield a greater influence over him it was ascribed to the great and revered law-giver Moses. They put in the mouth of Moses (Deut. 12) a clear and emphatic prohibition of all places of worship outside the central sanctuary. Acting on the requirements of the newly received law of supposedly Mosaic origin, Josiah vigorously pushed the crusade against the multiplicity of sanctuaries and succeeded in exterminating them. And now the author of Chronicles, living in the time when centralized worship was a long-standing fact, and supposing it divinely commanded from the beginning, makes apologies for irregularities in the lives of the good Kings of Judah. David did not go to the authorized high-place at Gibeon, where the tabernacle and altar were, because he could not, for "he was afraid because of the sword of the angel" (I Chron. 21 : 30). Solomon's worship at Gibeon is excused because the tabernacle was there although the ark was at Jerusalem (I Chron. 16 : 39). Chronicles also records attempted removal of altars and images by Asa and Jehoshaphat.

The strong points in this argument are Samuel's worship and sacrifice at various places, Elijah's lament over the breaking down of Jehovah's altars in Israel, and the general neglect of this law by all good Kings down to Hezekiah and Josiah, in the face of so clear a statement as Deut. 12, and so evident an interpretation of it as by Phinehas and his committee in the time of Joshua (ch. 22). If Deuteronomy 12 and Joshua 22, as we now have them existed all along, how can such neglect of it be explained?

However much we may admit the force of this reasoning, or be perplexed at the sight of the snags in the course, yet it is difficult and for many of us impossible to abandon the old course and turn our frail barks in the wake of these great steamers. Tak-

ing Baudissin's article on the worship in high-places as a specimen—and it is as strong as any furnished by his school—we find in it more reasons for rejecting than for accepting his theory.

In the first place, the subject matter of the law in question with all its great importance for Israel at that time, is only a means to an end; only a hedge fence to keep out the evil, and not a vessel which itself contains the good. It is exactly parallel with Paul's case of eating meat offered to idols, only for Israel in his childhood it was far more needed as a safeguard. The substance aimed at was worship of the one true God. To worship him in one place only, was not, nor is, essential, as can be learned from the words of Jesus to the Samaritan woman (John 4: 21-24). But Israel and the inhabitants of these earthly tenements of clay, in general, were always inclined, not only to give to their deities "a local habitation and a name," but to limit each deity to his locality and thus divide the Godhead into as many separate gods as there were places of worship. To prevent this polytheism, with consequent denial of the one true Jehovah, in an age so prone to multiply, to localize, to incarnate its deities with all the carnal nature of man, God had to give and insist on this prohibitive law. That God, or even Moses himself, if he was anything of a thinker on these things, as we have reason to believe he was, should make such a law for such a people, in such surroundings, and at such a time as the Pentateuch supposes, does not seem in the least strange. Why should this law have had to wait for its promulgation until Israel had actually fallen the way it was always and strongly leaning? If God had anything to do with making laws for his people's future observance, this is the law we would expect him to make. That it took the people seven or eight centuries to get it fixed in their hearts is not strange. It is even possible that this law would have been more honored in the breach than in the keeping, for the future necessary enforcement of it was by no means complimentary to Israel. We can conceive such a spiritual state of Jehovah worship (as it really existed in some) that they could anywhere worship Jehovah in spirit and in truth. If Israel had kept the law of love as was demanded

of them, then this law could easily have fallen into meritorious disuse. However important this law was as a fence between the pure, exalted worship of God and the foul and groveling devotion to heathen deities, it was still secondary to that thing which it fenced in—love to Jehovah. This may explain why good kings like Asa and Jehoshaphat who lived in the midst of almost universal apostacy from Jehovah to Baal, felt they had done all they could in their day and generation, when they had reclaimed the worship of Jehovah, even though it be performed at their ancestral local shrines, instead of at the temple. These ancient worthies did much when they got the people to exchange Baal for Jehovah, the flesh for the spirit. What they did not do was to enforce the law which might have guarded what they had gained.

So much on the general import of the law in question. If now we examine the line of argumentation used by Wolf Baudissin in the above named article, we find a great deal that is not relevant to the case in hand. The fact that the patriarchs worshipped Jehovah at various places has not the least bearing on the case. If the law (Deut. 12) were one of morality or principle and not merely a preventive measure for an errant nation, the practice of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob might seem contradictory to it. But where there is no inclination to sin there is no need of restriction. The patriarchs worshipped Jehovah and Him alone and were not in danger of being lead astray, as was the nation of Israel. In that case God was leading noble individual men. In this case He was leading a nation—educating a mob of slaves to become a nation of sons of God.

Again, from ancient times down to the actual establishment of a central place of worship in the temple (I Kings 3 : 2), that law was not really broken which distinctly says, "when He giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that you dwell in safety then there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause His name to dwell there" (Deut. 12 : 10, 11). Even the tabernacle, wandering as it did from place to place, now having the ark of the covenant and now again without it; was not the realization of Deut. 12 : 10, 11. A wandering sanctuary

still partakes of the nature of a multiplicity of localities and is not as effective a means of teaching the unity of God as one fixed abode like the temple. This removes censure from the action of Moses, Joshua and those other Israelites in so far as they are approved by the Biblical record, *i. e.*, in so far as they were not idolatrous in their intention. Besides many of the apparent violations of this law in Judges are cases where angels or theophanies had appeared. And where God is manifestly present there He is to be worshipped, all legislation to the contrary notwithstanding.

The apparently strange conduct of Samuel looks different when we remember that in his troublous times Israel was far from having "rest from all her enemies round about" (Deut. 12:10) and was entirely without a central place of worship, for the ark, the presence of Jehovah, was from the childhood of Samuel until the days of David either in the land of the uncircumcised Philistines or hidden away for fear of it in the house of Obed Edom. Samuel, therefore, worshipped God as the Lord dictated to him, and no true worship was undertaken during his lifetime without the sanction and presence of Samuel, the man of God, the Moses of his day and generation.

Again, Elijah's lament that the altars of God were thrown down is misunderstood if taken as a contradiction to the divine command existing in Deuteronomy at the time when the lament was uttered. What did Elijah lament? Certainly, not the overthrow of the altars. What did those who threw them down intend by the action? Certainly, not the reduction of the number of places of worship, in the sense in which the Assyrian understood Hezekiah's reformation. Not at a mode of worship but at Jehovah himself were their blows aimed, and this Elijah lamented. Should, for instance, a noted blasphemer take a crucifix of Christ and dash it to pieces, the most iconoclastic Protestants would condemn the hateful deed, and it would not mean that the Protestant Church had come to take sides with the Catholic Church. The one aims at the image, the other at the Christ. With Jezebel it was not a choice between altars and temples but between Jehovah and Baal, and the rejection of Jehovah in the

overthrow of his altars was that against which he fought as his name indicates, Eli-jah my God is Jehovah. When there was no Jehovah worship left in Israel, when even the private altars where He had been worshipped were thrown down, why should Elijah at such a time cry over the law that was to be a safeguard to that now departed worship, no matter how zealous he might have been, had there been in existence a Jehovah cultus to be guarded by such a means as Deut. 12 lays down, and as Israel exercised in its entrance into Canaan (Josh. 22). Now he had a greater matter in hand, viz., the very existence of Jehovah worship in Israel.

There are minor points along the line of Baudissin's article to which we can hardly give assent. On page 187 he seems to ascribe to Solomon the initiative of centralization, for he says, when Solomon built the magnificent Zion Temple over the sacred ark, he doubtless intended to raise this sanctuary to be the chief sanctuary of his people in order to enhance the glory of his royal residence through the vast assemblies on the feast days." This may be human, and *may* have been Solomon's motive, but it is an assumption entirely without basis if not without bias. Such a vain motive would scarcely have escaped the censure of the Spirit, which we must admit ruled the composition of the Old Testament.

That the law of Deut. 12 was not in existence and the Solomonic temple was disregarded by Israel (the true and proper Israel) cannot be proved by the conduct of Northern Israel, which is *in toto* condemned by the prophets and the historic books, as contrary to the spirit of the Jehovah cultus. That Jehu stopped short in his work of reform is a sin for which he and his house paid the penalty (2 Kings 28 : 10-36 ; 31). All the references in the prophets to a cultus outside of Jerusalem are either in disapproval (Am. 8 : 14 ; 4 : 4 ; Hosea 4 : 15 ; 10 ; 5) or in condemnation of their idolizing a place at the expense of Him who can make any place holy by His presence (Matt. 23 : 16-23). They insist on seeking God and not the place (Am. 5 : 5).

On page 188 Baudissin ventures the supposition that because Sennacherib's host fell before Jerusalem the thought was strengthened that Jerusalem was the true dwelling place of God. But



Sennacherib was in all likelihood on his way to Egypt when his host was slain, and not before Jerusalem, for, according to Herodotus, the Egyptian priests claim that *their* prayer brought on his destruction. There can scarcely be any special sanctity ascribed to Jerusalem when an enemy is slain on his way to another place. To Jehovah, not to Jerusalem, belongs this credit. Again, there is no trace in history of such an ascription of sanctity to Jerusalem in consequence of this event.

As to Josiah's reformation, it received a new impulse from Deuteronomy, but to conclude that such a law did not exist previously, and this in the face of the energetic though abortive attempts of Hezekiah is too much to draw from so slight a premise. It is doubtful whether at this time any place remained where Jehovah continued to be worshipped. All worship, even that in the temple courts, was idolatrous. This aroused even Hezekiah already to endeavor to eradicate all shrines out of the land, and Josiah, tender hearted toward God and his worship, was fired with irresistible zeal in the same direction by the reading of the long lost but newly discovered law.

To say that the Tabernacle was a fictitious painting of history (page 191); to say that the author of Chronicles invented an angel scene to excuse David's worshipping at Araunah instead of Gibeon (I. Chron. 21 : 30), and then to say (page 192) that he invented a new tent for the ark so as to have the old tent at Gibeon by which to justify Solomon's service there; to say that these are expedients of his perplexity to establish in his history the unity of place of worship, ascribes a duplicity and dishonesty to an author which we cannot ascribe to the writer of any book of the Bible. To assume that the books in the Bible were written even as a *pious* fraud seems to militate against the law of cause and effect. Such a book would be unable to make such scrupulously honest men as the Bible has always produced. Even should we *believe* the author or authors to have been honest it is difficult to see how they could beget better than themselves.

With all these obstacles in the way of the modern theories, bleiben wir beim Alten denn mit allem Mischen und Kneten gibts doch Kein Brot wie's die Armen wollen.

## VI.

### A STUDY OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

BY CHARLES E. CREITZ.

What is the Sermon on the Mount? What is its central theme, if it has any? Are the different parts related to each other? or does it consist of a number of ideas thrown together at random, and without any reference to cause or sequence? How does it stand related to the Old Testament dispensation? What place does it occupy in the New dispensation? Is it evangelical or not? Is it one discourse or only the more essential teachings of numerous addresses collected in one place by St. Matthew? These and other questions have often been asked with reference to the Sermon on the Mount, and the answers given to them have been widely different.

There is little agreement among scholars as to what constitutes the fundamental idea of the Sermon. Lange says it is "The righteousness of the Kingdom of Heaven in its relation to that of the Old Testament theocracy"; but in his exposition of the Sermon he does not adhere very closely to his own definition. Tholuck finds the central thought of the Sermon in the idea that by it Christ sought "to exhibit Himself as the Fulfiller of the Law, and to enunciate the Magna Charta of His new Kingdom." Canon Gore calls it "The moral law of the Kingdom of Christ," which he explains further by saying that "it occupies in the New Testament the place which in the Old Testament is occupied by the Ten Commandments." J. Oswald Dykes finds in it "A proclamation or manifesto published by the King of the new spiritual Israel upon this first public occasion, but couched in the form of a royal charge to His first subjects and earliest ministers." Chemnitz calls it "The address of installation of the apostles into their office"; while Rosenmüller discovers that the object of

Christ was "to crush the prevalent carnal expectations with reference to the Messiah." Ewald and Delitzsch it seems are unable to find in it any unity of thought by the ordinary methods of interpretation, and so they resort to certain symbolic numbers around which they make the different parts of the Sermon to cluster. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) in his book "The Mind of the Master" finds the *Gospel* in the Sermon; while many others are equally positive that it is but the *Law* of the Old Testament highly spiritualized; that it can reveal sin, but not cure it; that it can kill, but not make alive. Some see in it a discourse constructed on the basis of the strictest rules of logic and rhetoric; others cannot discover even so much as would correspond to the string which holds beads together in a certain order.

Perhaps a correct answer to many of these questions, at least so far as the mind and intention of Christ is concerned, must wait on the answer to the question: Is the Sermon on the Mount one discourse, delivered substantially as reported by St. Matthew, or is it only a summary of His teaching gathered from numerous addresses?

If the record of this Sermon made by St. Matthew were the only one in the Gospels, this question would probably never have arisen in the ordinary mind; but since many of the teachings of the Sermon are found scattered through the Gospel by St. Luke, and some of them in the Gospel by St. Mark, where they are represented as having been spoken on widely different occasions, the question naturally arises: Is the Sermon as recorded by St. Matthew a compilation, or is it the record of a continuous discourse, delivered at a definite time and place?

This will probably always remain an open question. Much can be said on either side. Scholars differ. We know that St. Matthew had a peculiar gift of bringing together similar incidents and sayings of our Lord. He had been a tax gatherer, and he seems to have carried the methods of the accountant into his work of an apostle and the writing of a Gospel. But if St. Matthew gathered the Sermon on the Mount from the different addresses of Jesus and arranged it in its present order, he must

have been an editor of consummate wisdom and skill; for notwithstanding the diversity of opinion as to the unity of the Sermon, it still stands, when rightly understood, without a rival, the world's masterpiece of moral and ethical instruction, and the most perfect delineation of the most exalted spiritual character.

For the present at least, I prefer to believe that Jesus was the author both of the material and of the arrangement of the sermon. Holding this view, it will now be possible to give a more intelligent answer to the question: What is the Sermon on the Mount? It is preëminently what the Church has been in the habit of calling it—a sermon, and a sermon, too, in which Christ did not propose to say all that He knew or all that He expected to say during His public ministry. There are some who approach the Sermon with the expectation of finding in it all that can be said or known concerning God, man and salvation; and if they cannot find what they are seeking they endeavor to read into the Sermon what Christ left out of it.

The first essential in understanding *this* Sermon, as well as any other, is to know the purpose of the Preacher and the general character of His discourse. "If we regard Him as a monarch delivering a coronation address; or as the founder of an Empire announcing its constitution; or a Lawgiver issuing a second Decalogue; or the Head of the apostolate giving their commission to the twelve," we shall find difficulty in making the Sermon fit these conceptions of our minds.

A glance at the historical situation may help to give us a simpler and more natural impression of the Sermon. St. Matthew with a few strokes of his pen paints for us a picture of the scene where the Sermon was preached. "And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain; and when he was set, his disciples came unto him; and he opened his mouth and taught them, saying." How natural, how simple, how beautiful! Christ loved the mountains; to them He often went for rest and prayer. When the crowds pressed Him, and the noise and tumult of the world wearied Him, He would seek the lonely companionship and the quiet restfulness of hills and mountains, where He could refresh Himself by com-

munion with God and nature. At this time already His popularity had become so great that He found it increasingly difficult to escape from the crowds which were pressing Him on every side. On this occasion multitudes had gathered to see and hear Him, among whom, no doubt, were many who cared only for loaves and fishes. From some elevation on the mountain side, He addressed to them this matchless Sermon. Many have tried to *guess* the spot where Jesus stood; for certainty of knowledge concerning it, there can doubtless be none. It was in the neighborhood of Capernaum, but there are so many hills and eminences which would answer the requirements of the Gospel narrative, that it is impossible to fix on any specific one as the scene of this discourse.

It has been supposed by some that the Sermon was delivered only to the inner circle of His disciples, while the multitude were waiting in the back-ground. The narrative itself, however, does not make such a construction necessary; in fact, it hardly warrants it. The twelve had not yet been formally chosen at this time. The word disciple here is evidently a general term, applied to the crowds which were more or less regularly attending upon the public teachings of Jesus. The Sermon evidently was not intended for the esoteric few, but for the whole human race. While the truths which He taught were differently apprehended by different individuals and classes, it was nevertheless intended that all should hear it.

And what does Christ say? "He opened His mouth and taught them saying." He delivers to them an address. The Church calls it a sermon. He had something to teach, as He always had when people were willing to be taught. The teaching related to the Kingdom of God which was at hand. It was not an inaugural address, however, in the strict sense of that word. It does not contain an outline of the plan of salvation; nor does it lay down what is most fundamental in His new Kingdom except in so far as He Himself is in and through and back of His own teachings; for Christ Himself is the ultimate ground of the Kingdom of God.

To my mind the Sermon contains the most important of His early ethical teachings, and these follow in a certain regular order

and harmony which must not be overlooked. Christ observed the laws of the mind in this Sermon as any other maker of a discourse is supposed to do. When one has anything to say, he usually says it in a more or less orderly way. When Christ taught His disciples, He observed the same rule. There are those, however, who can find no order of thought or arrangement in this Sermon and to whom each paragraph stands unrelated and by itself, and may therefore be studied without any reference to what precedes or follows. A careful study of the Sermon, however, will, I think, repay the student by giving him a clearer insight into the unity and orderliness of the discourse.

Let us briefly follow what appears to be the argument of the Sermon as indicated by the arrangement of the material. I shall make no effort to state the theme of the Sermon, except to say in a general way that it deals with the Kingdom of God, for under this general head, the different sections can, I think, be legitimately introduced.

In the first beatitude we have the condition of entrance into the Kingdom. By Kingdom here we must understand a spiritual rather than a material Kingdom—a Kingdom more real, however, if possible than one with outward organization. This Kingdom has its King, its laws and its subjects. The citizens of this Kingdom are supposed to be happy in the best sense of that word; but happiness does not consist in the accidents or outward things of life, but in that which belongs to the essence of life. It does not come from what a man has, where he is, or from the environment in which he lives, but from *what he is*. The quality of his essential life will determine whether he will be happy or miserable. The happiness of the citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven comes from their life and character, and not from anything that is external to them.

But life cannot be hid. It will reveal itself. Its very nature is to reproduce itself. It is also diffusive and preservative. Life permeates an entire organism and when the life goes out, the organism decays and perishes. Therefore the citizens of this new kingdom who have life and an abundance of it, can not live in



the world without affecting it. Christ calls them the salt of the earth and the light of the world.

This inner life of the soul or spirit, however, is no more free than the outer life. In His new Kingdom law is to take a more exalted place than it occupied in the Old dispensation. Here it is to gain a spiritual meaning and content which it never had before ; so that "unless your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven," for in this Kingdom mere negative virtue does not count. Merely not being like other men, may be very far from being fit for the Kingdom of Heaven. The spirit of the Father reflected in the life of His children, alone will stand the test here.

Those who belong to this Kingdom are detached from the world. They no longer live for the world. Her applause they count of little value. Therefore they will not do their alms before men to be seen of them. Their devotions will no longer be conducted before the public for their approval. Fasting will now become a spiritual exercise instead of a public show.

Such a man will learn to distinguish between the substance and the shadow of things. The new Kingdom will become to him as real, if not more so, as the world in which he lives. He now adopts and uses the coin of the new Kingdom and instead of laying up gold and silver on earth, he gathers treasures in heaven, for those are the enduring riches. He now sees with new eyes, and from a different point of view. "If thine eye be single thy whole body will be full of light."

He will not attempt the impossible—a happy divided heart ; for no man can serve two masters. The citizen of the heavenly Kingdom, therefore, will absolutely renounce his allegiance to all worldly potentates for he recognizes only one Lord, and He is also his Father. Therefore he will not be over-anxious concerning his bodily necessities. His Father will provide ; and besides, is not the life more than meat and the body than raiment ?

But one whose great aim is to live the perfect life of God—to be good and to do good, is often in great danger of becoming

harsh in his judgment of others. He becomes impatient with the slow pace of righteousness. He would call down fire from Heaven to consume the adversaries of the Kingdom. The sword would not always be an unwelcome aid to the promotion of right. Therefore judge not, that ye be not judged. Cast not your pearls before swine.

But who is sufficient for these things? None of himself. Therefore ask and it shall be given you, for if ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him. And in the degree in which the spirit of God will possess the life, in that degree will each one look not upon his own things but upon the things of others. Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.

To do this, however, is not easy. You must enter in at the straight gate and walk along a narrow road. Your companions will be few, for not many enter this gate and travel this road; and besides all this, there will likely be imposters in the little crowd, who follow from wrong motives and whose teaching and influence are dangerous. You need not be deceived, however; they may be recognized. By their fruit ye shall know them; for this is a universal law that a good tree will bring forth good fruit and a corrupt tree will bring forth evil fruit.

All men's works will some day be tested, whether they are good or bad; and then "not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my father which is in heaven." The real and the spurious, the substance and the shadow, the true and the false, in every man's life will then be made manifest.

It will be seen from this effort to follow the argument of the Sermon that it is not impossible to see what appears to me a certain natural order of development, where one idea leads naturally to the one succeeding. The Sermon partakes of the nature of a strong address. It lays down principles; fortifies them by argument and illustration; applies them to the life; threatens, ex-

horts and persuades. All, however, with an authority that surprises His hearers. In fact, many of His profoundest teachings seem to be declared merely on the authority of the Teacher. These teachings, however, were not true simply because He uttered them; but He uttered them because they were true; and He trusted in the sovereignty of truth to secure their acceptance.

Let us now turn to the teachings of the Sermon and examine them a little more in detail. We have already assigned to the Sermon a general subject. We have looked at the historical situation in which it was spoken, and have followed the development of its thought as indicated by the arrangement of its material; and it may now be profitable to look as closely as time will permit into the teaching of the Sermon itself.

The first group of ideas is generally considered under the general title, The Beatitudes. Of these there are eight as must be evident to every student who approaches them without prejudice in favor of some preconceived theory. It is true that the eighth beatitude differs in some important respects from those which precede it. The first seven are beatitudes of character. The eighth is a beatitude of condition. The Sermon never loses sight of the fact that the citizens of the new Kingdom are also citizens of the world, and that they must necessarily sustain some relation to the world, and the world to them. Now a character such as that described in the first seven beatitudes will naturally and inevitably provoke the hostility and antagonism of wicked men. The world can not understand or appreciate such a character. The teachings of the beatitudes in the main contradict the positions of the world. The poor, the mourners, the meek, the hungry, the merciful, the pure, the peacemakers, the persecuted, Christ calls blessed. What irreconcilable paradoxes! The rich and prosperous, the joyful and gay, the strong and powerful, the banqueters and well-filled, the overbearing and cruel, the very gods for the privilege of indulging their base passions with impunity, the war-maker and conqueror, the honored and respected—these the world envies and pronounces happy. The world teaches that man's happiness consists in the abundance of

the things which he possesseth, and in the outward circumstances of his life. Christ taught that blessedness was the result of character; that what a man is will determine how he will feel and not *vice versa*.

A study of each beatitude by itself would be exceedingly profitable; but nothing more can be attempted here than the barest suggestion of some of the rich truths with which this Sermon is crowded to repletion. After describing the character of a citizen of the Kingdom of heaven, Christ proceeds to indicate the relation which such a character should sustain to the world. Ye are the salt of the earth and the light of the world. The teaching of this paragraph is very plain. It is the Christian's duty to exercise a positive influence for good in the world. This is to be done in a two-fold way, the emblems of which are salt and light. Of these two salt is emblematic of the silent, unseen influence which results from character—the permeation of the whole life with the spirit of the Kingdom. That which makes salt useful is the quality of its saltiness, for if the salt have lost its savor wherewith shall it be salted. So a man who has lost the influence of character is good-for-nothing.

But there is also a more active and aggressive way for Christians to impress themselves upon the world. They are to be its light. The nature of light will help to make clear this statement. Light reveals, makes clear, purifies, brings order out of chaos. It is active, aggressive, penetrating. So men imbued with the spirit of the kingdom will seek to dispel the world's darkness and gloom. By their thought and activity they will help to bring order out of chaos. They will seek to solve the moral problems of the world. What light has been shed upon the world's pathway by such men as Moses and Paul, Elijah, and John the Baptist; and this not only by the influence of their christian character; but also by the contributions of their intellect. How many ethical and philosophical problems they solved for the world! What a flood of light they have flashed into the intellect and heart of the race! To a greater or less degree all Christians are called upon to be light-bearers for the world. Every life may

be a center of light ; consciously, deliberately sending out rays to make clearer the pathway of those around him.

The substance of the next paragraph may be entitled : The laws of the New Kingdom in their relation to the laws of the Old Testament. The expounder of this new law naturally defines first His own attitude toward the old. This was especially necessary, since the impression had already gone forth that He was a destroyer of ancient laws, customs and beliefs. Therefore He clearly and positively asserts that He did not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil them. The indestructible cannot be destroyed. Whatever laws God had ordained, and declared through the prophets must remain inviolable. He of course is not now thinking of the ceremonial law so much as of the ethical or moral law ; even though it is true that He came to fulfil also the ceremonial law. All types and shadows found their fulfillment and substance in Him. But as one reads through the section of the Sermon which deals with the law, one can scarcely help but feel that Christ's thought was of the moral rather than the ceremonial law of the Old Testament, for He nowhere makes any reference whatever to the ceremonial law. He was not thinking now so much of mint, and anise and cummin, as of judgment, mercy and faith. The law in this sense cannot be destroyed, for the basis of the moral law is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. Time cannot change it ; circumstances cannot affect it ; rulers cannot abrogate it ; and Christ Himself was bound by it. So He declared that instead of a destroyer of the law, He came to give it a richer, fuller, diviner meaning, for even the moral law of the Old Testament was but very imperfectly understood and still more imperfectly expounded and practiced, so that Christ both by precept and by practice gave it a significance which it never had before.

In the 17th verse Christ laid down a general principle. Then He proceeded to explain and illustrate His meaning by a number of different examples taken from the moral law of the Old Testament. We must remember, of course, that the laws of the Old dispensation dealt with specific sins, rather than with broad funda-

mental principles. This was a necessity for the race in its youth-time of life. A child will more readily grasp the significance of a specific prohibition, than that of a general principle; and a child in intelligence and moral capacity, though a man in body and years, must be dealt with on the principle of the Old Testament. The preacher who failed to break up the habit of log-stealing among his wood-men parishioners, by preaching repeatedly from the text, Thou shalt not steal or some similar general prohibition, was immediately successful when he changed his text to, Thou shalt not steal thy neighbor's logs. Not that I would approve of changing the text of Scripture to suit the occasion of the sermon, but this is an illustration of how definite and explicit one must often be to reach the conscience and moral sense of his hearers. This was largely God's method of dealing with His ancient people. His laws served as a schoolmaster to lead them to Christ. Now a pupil does not usually read more into the teacher's rules than the most literal meaning of the words will bear. It was, therefore, not very probable that the Jews under the law would make the moral requirements any harder than God seemed to have made them. True their consciences must often have been ill at ease with their cold and heartless obedience, and then they would proceed to add another formal requirement to the law, the life of which had already been crushed out by the weight of external detail with which it was encumbered. Jesus now proceeds to show how narrow their construction of the law was. To illustrate this point, He takes up the 6th commandment. The law said: Thou shalt not kill. That was easily enough understood. As long as one abstained from the shedding of the blood of another, he was strictly within the requirements of this law. This was the way in which Jewish lawyers expounded this law, and this is the way in which laws are often expounded to this day. We are still very far from being able to interpret and apply law according to the spirit, rather than the letter. As a conspicuous illustration, witness the interpretation put on a recent statute on the temperance question, by the Attorney General of the United States. Many things are lawful which are not right.



Christ declares that they of old times said: Thou shalt not kill, and whoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. That is one way of looking at the law; but there is another. Instead of looking at it as a law forbidding some specific act, it may be regarded as embodying a great general principle for the regulation of the life, for after all the motive which actuates one's conduct determines to a great extent the quality of the act. What is the attitude of the heart of the murderer toward his victim? May there not after all be the shedding of blood without real guilt? And, if this is true, may there not be guilt without the shedding of blood? This is the truth which Christ endeavors to press on the minds and hearts of His hearers. The attitude of one's heart toward his fellow-man determines the degree of criminality which must be attached to an overt act; and this attitude itself may be criminal.

Christ specifies at least three grades of sin short of actual murder which are prohibited by this Commandment—anger, hasty, unkind speech and deliberate insult. To each one of these Christ has attached a penalty.

Judged by these requirements, who is clear from the breaking of the Sixth Commandment? What a large meaning these few words all at once acquire! Yet nothing less than this is included in the prohibition of the Sixth Commandment.

This short exposition of Christ's treatment of the Sixth Commandment in relation to the principle which He enunciated when He declared that He had not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfill them, must serve as an illustration of Christ's method of treatment in this part of the Sermon, for I cannot do more than merely call your attention to the other examples with which He deals in a similar way.

He next takes up the Seventh Commandment, and you know to what a sublime height of purity He lifts its requirements.

Then the subject of false swearing is discussed. This sin involves the breaking of two Commandments in one act—the Third and the Ninth. In this instance, therefore, Jesus does not quote directly from the Decalogue.

He now turns from these negative illustrations to two which are more positive in their character. The old law said : An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth ; but he said : Resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also.

In the next and last illustration of the principle which he announced at the beginning of this paragraph, he reaches the very climax of unselfish love for one's neighbor. How He here enlarges, widens and fills with a divine significance the old law : Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy, when *He* says : Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you. The requirements are high, but Christ exemplified them in His own life.

The seventh chapter opens with a paragraph on the laws which should govern one's personal and private religious life. The structure of this paragraph is very similar to that of the preceding one. Christ lays down a general principle, which He then proceeds to illustrate by examples. The revised version here translates : Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men. Here we have the principle that it is wrong to do acts of righteousness for the purpose of display. Alms giving, prayer and fasting were regarded by the Jews as acts indicative of special piety. Hence the danger of engaging in these religious acts for the approval of men rather than the approval of God. This danger still exists. One is often more zealous, punctual and devoted in his public than in his private devotions.

The first example which Christ uses is that of alms giving. The Jewish laws afforded conspicuous protection for the poor. They were intended in the first place to prevent poverty, and in the next place to relieve it when it existed. Giving, therefore, occupied a very large and prominent place in the Jewish system. Much of it was obligatory, but a great deal was given voluntarily, and what more natural than for those who gave more than the law required, to give in such a way that the public might at least be left into the secret. At first they may have felt that "it

was very nice to do a good act in secret and then have it found out by accident." But such accidents will not always happen when wanted ; and what more natural now, than to offer a little assistance in bringing one's good deeds before the public ; and this will easily go over into doing good to be seen of men. Against this practice Christ raised His voice. He sought to restore almsgiving to its rightful position in the religious life. He taught the people to see Himself in the poor, and that out of love for Him they should care for them. This was to be its own sufficient reward.

Prayer also had been degraded to a mere exercise for public show. Christ applied the law of secrecy severely to this religious act and in this connection gave to the world its model prayer.

Then Christ proceeds to apply this same law to fasting, which had been made by the Jews an outward badge of piety, which could be seen and read of men. By means of these three examples taken out of the religious life of the people Christ teaches that the spirit alone determines the worth of any religious act.

In the next paragraph Christ takes up the distinction between the real and the unreal, the abiding and the transitory in life, and warns against the danger of coveting that which is uncertain, unreal, and transitory. For applause or public approval, men will give alms, pray, fast, but they have their reward. But what kind of a reward ? A reward that lasts only so long as men can give and pray and fast, on the one hand, and receive the approval of their fellows on the other. Such men degrade themselves. Their heart is wrong. They fail to distinguish between the true and the false. They live for the world and wish to live also partly for heaven. They are anxious about what the world can give and desire also a share of what heaven can bestow. They worry over food and raiment and draw away the heart from God.

In a general way it may be said that this paragraph lays down the law of man's relation to this world—not as evil but as good. while in the next paragraph the law governing men's relation to the world of sin and evil is declared. The seventh chapter opens

in a sense abruptly by saying : Judge not that ye be not judged. This refers to our judgment of the evil deeds of other men. We are not forbidden to distinguish between different acts, but this law forbids us to pass judgments upon others which we would not be willing to have them pass upon us under similar circumstances. The golden rule must govern here as in every other relation with one's fellows.

Divine help is now promised to all those who seek it. This alone will assure safety. By this power alone can one hope to escape the evil that is in the world.

Then follows a paragraph on how to detect false teachers in the Kingdom, and finally the method of testing men's deeds is declared in a marvelously graphic description of the last day.

It remains but to compare briefly the Sermon on the Mount as recorded by St. Matthew (which in this study we have regarded as substantially delivered at one time and place) with similar teachings found in different parts of Mark and Luke.

One of the problems with which modern criticism is occupied, is the relation which the Gospels bear to each other. Upon a discussion of this problem we are not called to enter. We shall endeavor simply to treat of the relation of some of these different accounts, of practically the same teaching, to each other. In the Sermon as recorded by St. Matthew we find a great deal that has nothing to correspond to it in the other evangelists. Almost the entire section on the laws of the Old Testament, with their spiritual treatment, is omitted from the other Gospels. The duty of privacy in prayer, alms giving, and fasting, is recorded only by St. Matthew.

But where the different accounts relate to the same subjects the teachings are often strikingly similar. This has been regarded as evidence that the Sermon is a compilation. There can be little doubt that Christ discussed the same subjects at different times and on different occasions. To my mind the most satisfactory explanation of the different accounts of the Sermon is, that Christ delivered it substantially as recorded by St. Matthew, and that during His public ministry He emphasized again

and again its essential teachings, always taking account of the new conditions under which He spoke.

Let us take one conspicuous example as an illustration. In St. Matthew we have the initial beatitude in this form : Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven. St. Luke has it : Blessed are ye poor for yours is the Kingdom of God. A superficial glance at these two statements will reveal the fact that the one is general and the other specific. The one lays down a general principle ; the other takes up a definite and specific case. The one applies to all men universally ; the other to say the least could apply only to some. The first statement can easily be proved to be true ; but the second, if it were made to read, as it does *not* read, but as it is often *made* to read, viz. : Blessed are the poor, could not be proved to be true ; for poverty in itself is not necessarily good. It is not true that the poor are necessarily good, and the rich necessarily bad. How then are we to explain these two statements ? This seems to me to be very easy, when we regard the first as having been uttered at a time when Jesus was laying down many of the fundamental moral principles of His Kingdom ; and the second as having reference to a specific class—to His own immediate disciples, for instance. The passage in Luke opens thus : And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples and said : Blessed are ye poor for yours is the Kingdom of God. St. Matthew says : And seeing the multitudes he went up into a mountain, and when he was set, his disciples came unto him and he opened his mouth and taught them, saying. The difference in the two situations seems easily apparent. It would be difficult to exclude the multitude from St. Matthew's audience, and it would be difficult to include them in St. Luke's. Here Christ is explicitly said to have addressed His disciples. It would also be perfectly natural for Him to say to His own disciples : Blessed are ye poor ; for in their case it was absolutely and literally true. But as a declaration of a general principle, this statement could not be supported. In its perverted form it has often been used by the enemies of religion against the soundness of the teachings of Christ. They say christianity favors the rich. It

trys to make people contented with their poverty. It teaches that men are more blessed in poverty than in the possession of wealth. It reproves any spirit of discontent with hard material conditions, and in this way it helps to secure the rich in the undisturbed enjoyment of their possessions. Such teachers forget, however, that St. Luke pronounces a woe upon the rich. In fact right here we see a very pronounced difference between Matthew and Luke. Matthew pronounces no woes.

From this illustration it will be seen, I think, that the teachings of St. Luke can best be explained by supposing that they were spoken at different times and places, and under conditions different from those in which the Sermon as recorded by St. Matthew was spoken.

The Sermon on the Mount appears to me to be one sermon. A common principle underlies its entire structure. It moves in one direction and ends in a tremendous climax which powerfully arrests the attention and arouses the conscience. The double simile of the closing paragraph forms one of the most vivid pictures of all literature, and when one has once looked upon it, he can never forget it. It is a peroration of consummate power and skill. It springs naturally out of the general trend of thought of the Sermon and gathers up the preceding teaching in the one sublime thought that blessedness consists in character and that character is evinced by conduct. Therefore, to be a christian means to do the will of Christ.

It will be readily seen, however, that the Mountain Sermon is not the whole of christianity. It makes no such claims for itself. It assumes throughout the sinfulness of human nature, and it lays bare with great skill the corruption of the human heart. But of the atonement through the blood of Jesus Christ it knows nothing. It is true that it postulates the Divinity of Christ, for He speaks in it as by a divine authority, and that not merely a delegated authority, but an authority which belongs to Him *essentially*. Taken by itself it might be made to teach salvation by character; but studied in the light of all the life and teachings of Christ, it must be taken as the portrayal of a char-



acter possible only to those who become reconciled to God by the blood of Jesus Christ. An injustice is done to the Sermon and to Christ when it is studied without any reference to the whole body of truth which He came to reveal.

The whole scheme of redemption has a moral end in view, and in a sense it is true that we are redeemed only to the extent to which a positive Christian character has been formed in us; but redemption is not the consequence of character, but character is the product of the redemptive forces operative in the life of the believer. Creeds and sacraments, the Word and the Church, have value only so far as they affect and change the life. So much at least is implied, if not explicitly taught by the Sermon. Here is a mirror in which one may see accurately reflected his own spiritual countenance. By the test which it provides one may know whether he is growing or standing still. Does Christ appear in your life more and more? He will never know you unless He does. Likeness to Himself is the goal of our existence.

## VII.

### THE THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT AS HELD BY THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY REV. CYRUS CORT, D.D.

Atonement, or *at-one-ment*, as the etymology of the word indicates, is the reconciliation of man to his Maker by the expiatory sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ. The love of God was the moving cause and the sacrificial death of Christ the procuring cause of our redemption. "Herein is love not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His son to be the propitiation for our sins." When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son \* \* \* by whom we have now received the atonement." It is useless to multiply scriptural passages on this point so clearly and fully set forth in the word of God.

All Christians agree that reconciliation has been effected between God and the fallen race of mankind by the mediation and redemption of Jesus Christ. But there is a great difference of opinion as to how this has been brought about. As a rule the early Church Fathers, during the first four centuries of the Christian era, adhered to the sacrificial language of the Old Testament and more or less clearly held the doctrine of expiation and satisfaction which ultimately came to scientific expression in the theory of Anselm propounded early in the twelfth century and which has been substantially adopted by orthodox Christendom, Roman Catholic and Protestant alike.

The early Church Fathers held that animal sacrifices, as typical expiations for sin, were instituted by divine command immediately after the Fall—hence it was that Abel offered unto God a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain because he not only

obeyed God in this respect, but he also personally recognized the necessity of sacrificial atonement in his acts of religious devotion.

Athanasius, the great champion of the orthodox faith, in speaking of the fundamental agreement between the doctrines of the Old and New Testament says, "What Moses taught these things his predecessor Abraham had preserved and what Abraham had preserved with those things Enoch and Noah were well acquainted, for they made a distinction between the clean and the unclean and were acceptable to God. Thus also in like manner Abel bore testimony; for he knew what he had learned from Adam and Adam himself taught what he had previously learned from the Lord."

The sacrificial element of the Mosaic economy was in perfect harmony with the Patriarchal worship, as that was practiced by the most illustrious spiritual heroes mentioned in the grand catalogae of ancient worthies given in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. It was a fundamental principle under the Abrahamic covenant that "without the shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin." Sacrificial expiation and substitution afforded a measure of access to the presence and favor of a just and holy God, who was also a merciful and gracious God. The daily offering of spotless lambs at the sanctuary of Jehovah and the multitudinous sacrifices at the Passover festival testify emphatically to the Hebrew sense of atonement or reconciliation as a matter of expiation and substitution. They all looked beyond to the great Atonement when Messiah, as Priest and victim in one, should offer Himself as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world.

Moses in the law, and the prophets and the psalms, all testify emphatically as Jesus assured His disciples after His resurrection that Christ must needs suffer as He did and die for the sins of mankind in order to enter into His glory and prepare the way for heirs of immortal glory. In this as in all other respects Jesus came to fulfill every jot and tittle of the law and prophets.

John, the Baptist, the great herald of Messiah, points to Jesus explicitly as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the

world. As a true and perfect man Jesus instinctively shrank from the horrors and pains of death and prayed to the Father in heaven that if it were possible this cup might pass from Him without His being compelled to drink it. But it was not possible. For this purpose He had come unto this hour and how else could the Scriptures be fulfilled? The Father loved Him because as the good and true Shepherd He was ready to lay down His life for the sheep.

It is a comforting and momentous fact that we are redeemed not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ as a lamb without blemish and without spot. The redemption of the soul is precious, and the costliest price in the universe has been paid for our redemption by the Lord of life and glory. "Once for all," for all men and for all time, Jesus entered the Holy of Holies, sprinkled the mercy seat with His own blood and obtained eternal redemption for all that obey Him, and come to God with trust in His merits and mediation.

The Heidelberg Catechism sets forth the Reformed doctrine in an authoritative manner, at least for all Reformed pastors, professors and people. Whether they all loyally hold and teach it is another question. We are taught in the answer to the first question that "our only comfort in life and death is that with body and soul we are not our own, but belong unto our faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who with His precious blood hath fully satisfied for all our sins and redeemed us from all the power of the devil," etc.

The entire Catechism, like the sacred scriptures, is permeated with this thought set forth in the 67th answer—"that the Holy Ghost teaches us in the Gospel and assures us by the sacraments that the whole of our salvation depends upon that one sacrifice of Christ which he offered for us on the cross."

"The view implicitly received by the early Church Fathers," says Dr. A. A. Hodge in Herzog's Encyclopedia, "was first scientifically defined by Anselm in his epoch-making book, 1109 A. D., *Cur Deus Homo*." He taught that sin is debt or guilt;

that under the government of God it is absolutely necessary that the debt should be paid, *i. e.*, that the penalty incurred by the guilt of sin should be suffered, that this necessity has its ground in the infinite perfections of the divine nature; that this penalty must be inflicted upon the sinner in person, unless a substitute can be found having all legal qualifications for his office. This was alone realized in Jesus Christ, a divine person embracing a human nature."

This theory of Anselm was substantially accepted by the best of the schoolmen, such as Bonaventura, Alex Hales, Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas.

The reformers before the Reformation, *e. g.*, Wickliffe and Wessel held strictly to the Anselmic doctrine which was subsequently adopted in the creeds of the Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic churches. The decrees of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent declare that "Jesus Christ, when we were enemies, merited justification for us by His sacred passion on the tree and satisfied God the Father for us." Our own Heidelberg Catechism tells us in Ans. 12 "That we must make full satisfaction either by ourselves or by another," further that we are incapable of making it ourselves and that Jesus Christ is the one mediator and redeemer (Ans. 60) and that God grants and imputes to true believers the perfect satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ \* \* \* as if they had fully accomplished all that obedience which Christ has accomplished for them."

The different Swiss, French and Belgic confessions, the 39 articles of the Church of England and the Presbyterian Westminster standards teach the same Anselmic theory of the atonement. It is the view that best accords with the sacrificial systems of the Patriarchal and Mosaic periods, with the language of Scripture under both dispensations and with the consensus of the orthodox Christian faith in all ages.

The new catechism, lately adopted unanimously by the dissenting bodies of Great Britain, *i. e.*, the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists of all phases, sets forth the Anselmic theory of the atonement. (See Ans 14 and 46.)

This is significant as the latest confessional deliverance of evangelical Protestantism. The Reformed Church in the United States is confessionally committed to the Anselmic theory of the atonement. The professors in her theological seminaries are specially bound with the solemnity of an official oath to teach and defend the doctrinal system of the Heidelberg Catechism. If any of our ministers or professors conscientiously believe that there is anything wrong in the fundamental statements of the confessional system of our reformation fathers, an earnest and honest effort should be made to correct the errors or mistakes of ancestors by laying the matter in proper form before the tribunals of the church having jurisdiction. This were nobler and better far than to ridicule, disparage or pervert the cherished doctrines of sainted forefathers many of whom sealed their faith with martyr blood.

Our most precious hymns center in the atoning death of our Lord Jesus Christ and are pervaded by the Anselmic theory of the atonement. "Rock of Ages," "Just as I Am," "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross," "Behold the Sin-Atoning Lamb," etc., are a few that we recall out of many which, like the song of Moses and the Lamb, chanted by glorified saints on the shores of eternal deliverance, are permeated or saturated with the blood of atonement.

It is much easier to ridicule a doctrinal system than to present one that does not contain greater errors and difficulties. The negative work of tearing down is much easier than the positive constructive work of building up something better.

This thought was forcibly impressed upon me when I heard the great infidel, Robert G. Ingersoll, deliver his famous lecture on "The gods" at Peoria, Ill., twenty-seven years ago, when he was comparatively unknown. He seemed like a giant in his efforts at pulling down the biblical theory of creation, but a veritable pigmy in his constructive efforts to present something more reasonable. So appear the efforts of those who assail the commonly received Anselmic theory of the atonement. While that theory may not, at all points, be entirely satisfactory, yet, up



to this time, no better theory has been given to the Church. We have no right to attack the position or theory of the Heidelberg Catechism, as wrong and incorrect, until we are able to present one more consistent with Scripture and right reason. The moral influence theory of Abelard has been rehashed with variations in modern times, by Socinus, Maurice, Jowett and Bushnell. But Lyman Abbott condemns it now as entirely unsatisfactory and unreasonable. The Mystical Theory which Dr. Abbott seems to favor, and which some of our Reformed divines seem to prefer, has important elements of truth, inasmuch as it makes great account of the Incarnation, through which reconciliation was effected fundamentally between the divine and human natures, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. But the Mystical Theory of atonement fails to make proper account of the forensic side or the idea of satisfaction by substitution and mediation, as revealed in the atoning death of our Redeemer who died, the just for the unjust, and gave Himself a ransom for us. Dr. Abbott says in his farewell discourse to Plymouth church that "sacrifice is not a condition of God's forgiveness, but the method by which He forgives; it is the method by which He pours His life into men that they may live." The distinction which he seeks to make between *condition* and *method* does not seem very clear, but evidently Dr. Abbott discards the Anselmic theory of the atonement, as set forth in orthodox Christian confessions.

The doctrine of the Incarnation, as developed by Mercersburg theologians and others, supplements but cannot set aside the juridical feature of the Anselmic theory of the atonement.

Dr. Cooper, in the April number of the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, shows that the vicarious sufferings of a Redeemer give unity and meaning to both the Old and New Testament Scriptures. When we enter the realm of free spirit or voluntary suffering the idea of substitution or assumption of guilt, or its penalty, is manifest as an established principle and practice among civilized nations. The system of suretyship has always existed since history began and organized governments were founded. One person is permitted to assume the obligations and suffer for the

shortcomings of another. In military conscriptive legislation that principle is fully recognized. One man becomes the substitute of another in matters of life and death. This custom is felt to be a wise and beneficent arrangement among all civilized governments.

Hence it is absurd to ridicule or discard the idea of vicarious sacrifice or the principle of satisfaction by substitution as a feature that cannot be admitted into the moral government of Jehovah. But this is what controversialists seem to do who discard the Anselmic theory of the Atonement. Their objections not only antagonize the orthodox faith of Christendom on a very vital and precious doctrine of our holy religion, but fly in the face of chief elements of law and jurisprudence among the most enlightened governments on earth. Here, as in other points, the plain teaching of God's word is confirmed by the best experience of mankind and the things on earth reflect the greater realities of the heavenly world, the natural corresponds to the spiritual.

It is a most precious truth that we have been redeemed by the blood of Christ from the curse of God's broken law, and that we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son by whom we have now received the atonement. We are poor, needy sinners, but Jesus is a greater Saviour even than we are sinners. His righteousness is sufficient to cover all our imperfections. Though our sins be as scarlet His blood can make them white as snow. And in that great day for which all other days are made, may we stand accepted in the Beloved, not having on our own righteousness, which is as filthy rags, but the righteousness, which is of God, by faith in Christ Jesus our Lord.

"Sinners, whose love can ne'er forget  
The wormwood and the gall,  
Go spread your trophies at His feet,  
And crown Him Lord of all."

## VIII.

### EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

#### DOCTRINES OF THE ATONEMENT.

Scarcely any theological doctrine is at present engaging so much attention as that of the atonement. There are some, however, who hold that this is all a superfluous expenditure of thought. Their contention is that the doctrine developed in the eleventh century by Anselm, and supposed to have been adopted in the sixteenth century by the Reformers, is the end of all Christian thought on the subject, and should now be accepted without question by all orthodox Christians. Much of this contention we believe to be due to ignorance of what Anselm and the Reformers really taught. Modern ideas are read into their language, and then the result thus obtained is proposed to be made into a standard by which the religious thinking of other men is to be measured; whereas, if their true theories were really understood, it would be found that very few now hold them, even among those who seem to be contending for them. We believe that a better understanding of the whole subject will be promoted by a more thorough study of the history of this doctrine; and we accordingly present in this paper the doctrines of Anselm, Luther, and Calvin, as set forth in the second volume of Dr. Reinhold Seeberg's *Dogmengeschichte*, published in 1898. Dr. Seeberg is professor of systematic theology in Erlangen, and of his ability and conscientious carefulness as a historian of dogmas there can be no question.

Anselm of Canterbury wrote his work on the atonement, *Cur Deus Homo*, probably in A. D. 1099. "In this work," says Dr. Seeberg, in the volume just referred to, pp. 51-52 "Anselm undertook for the first time in history to present a systematic doctrine of the work of redemption. The problem for Anselm

was the rational demonstration of the necessity of the incarnation and of redemption, which are not made necessary by the mere omnipotence of God. The idea that the devil has any just claim upon man is entirely out of the question. The solution of the problem presupposes the idea that man can obtain salvation only through remission of sins. Sin consists in the creature's withholding from God the honor which is his due. 'He who does not render to God the honor due Him, takes from God what is His own and dishonors God, and this is sin.\*' But he who does this violates the duty imposed upon man as a rational being. The possible expectation that the divine mercy might forgive sins gratuitously can not be realized, for the non-punishment of unexpiated sin would bring disorder into the kingdom of God; 'but it does not become God to forgive any disorder in His kingdom.' Order, however, is maintained by means of justice. 'Nothing is less tolerable in the order of things than that a creature should withhold the honor due to the Creator and should not be made to pay for it.' Therefore 'there is nothing that God insists upon more justly than the honor of His dignity.' From the necessity of upholding the order of the divine kingdom and the honor of God there follows the rule: *necesse est ergo, ut aut ablati honor solvatur aut poena sequatur*—'when the divine honor has been withheld, either payment must be made, or punishment must follow.' In either of these ways the divine honor may be vindicated. It may be vindicated in the way of punishment, since thereby God proves Himself to be master of rebellious man. Or it may be vindicated by the sinner's making good the violated order by means of voluntary satisfaction. Hence the above rule will take the following form: *Necesse est, ut omne peccatum satisfactio aut poena sequatur*—'Every sin must be followed by satisfaction or by punishment.' But God has not adopted the way of punishment, for in that case man would have utterly perished. God has chosen the way of satisfaction. As

\* The sentences enclosed in single inverted commas are quotations from the original work, which Seeberg gives in Latin, but which we reproduce in English as better suited to the purpose of the REVIEW.

men were created to fill up the number of fallen angels, God could not be willing to accept them as sinners, without satisfaction. But in order to satisfaction the rule is 'that it is not sufficient to give back what has been taken away, but, because of the insult which has been offered, more must be returned than was taken.' Since the smallest sin, for example, an unlawful look, weighs heavier than the whole world, it follows that a satisfaction must be presented to God which is greater than all that is not God. And as man dishonored God by allowing himself to be overcome by the devil, satisfaction now must involve an overcoming of the devil by man in circumstances of increased difficulty. If, then, satisfaction must be so great and comprehensive, it will follow that man, on his part, is absolutely incapable of making it; for whatever good he may do, it is his *duty* to do; and hence it can not be of the nature of satisfaction.

"The satisfaction required can only be made by God. But it must be made by man, by one who is of the same race, or who is of kin, with men: 'Satisfaction *can* not be made by another than God, nor *ought* it to be made by another than man; hence it must be made by a *God-man*.' The God-man must do something for the honor of God which on His own account He is under no obligation to do. This cannot be the obedient doing of the will of God, or the fulfilment of the divine law, for that is the duty of every rational being. The free surrender of His infinitely valuable life, however, is a sacrifice sufficient for the purpose of satisfaction. The infinite value of this life more than suffices for the satisfaction of the sins of the whole world. Hence follows the necessity of the incarnation and of the suffering of the God-man in order to the satisfaction of the divine honor. Only incidentally does Anselm speak of an organic connection between Christ and man, namely, when he points to the doctrine and example which He came to give. But these two points of view are not distinctly and clearly united. This defect explains the want of convincing force in what Anselm says of the manner in which the effect of Christ's work is supposed to be transferred to men. The *meritum* of Christ cannot be unrewarded by the

Father, for otherwise the latter would be either *injustus* or *impotens*. But inasmuch as it is not possible for the Father to give anything to the Son, since the latter has need of nothing, His merit properly redounds to the benefit of those for whom He died. 'To whom could He more properly impute the fruit and merit of His own death than to those on account of whose salvation He became man and to whom by dying He gave an example of suffering for the sake of righteousness, who indeed will be His imitators in vain, if they shall not be partakers of His merit?' Thus men's sins are remitted unto them. The divine justice and mercy are both preserved. The doctrine of Scripture is demonstrated by reason alone, *sola ratione*."

On this theory Dr. Seeberg, p. 53, makes the following remarks: "Worthy of acknowledgment is first of all the energetic affirmation of the forgiveness of sin as a consequence of redemption, as well as the profound consciousness of sin which the theory presupposes. On the other hand, however, the serious errors must by no means be ignored: (a) Anselm knows of none other than a legal relation between God and man; (b) redemption is referred quite one-sidedly to the death of Christ, which, in consequence of the purely juridical apprehension of satisfaction, is regarded as a legal performance rather than a moral act; (c) the connection between Christ's work and suffering is not explained; (d) the transference of Christ's merit to the Church is not made intelligible; (e) the change of mind which Anselm supposes to have taken place in God in consequence of Christ's death cannot be made intelligible to religious thought."

Anselm's theory was not generally accepted by the medieval theologians. Abelard disputed it, and taught the doctrine of atonement by *moral influence*. Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus both denied the *necessity of satisfaction*, and brought the doctrine of atonement into connection with the then current theory of *merit*. The death of Christ, they held, was not absolutely necessary in order to redemption. Other means would have been possible. The Reformers no longer understood Anselm's theory at all. Dr. Seeberg, p. 184, says, "it is not



correct to say, as Thomasius has said, that the fundamental thoughts of Anselm's theory have become common property in later theology. Anselm's theory is accepted by nobody; on the contrary the fundamental thoughts of Abelard are met with continually, although nearly always in connection with the old conception of Christ's merit as the ground of divine grace."

The Reformers generally adopted the theory of *vicarious or substitutionary punishment*. The suffering and death of Christ were regarded by them, not as a satisfaction to the divine honor, but as a satisfaction of divine justice by the actual payment of the penalty of human sin. Luther's theory is set forth by Dr. Seeberg, pp. 250-53, in the following language: "Faith in the grace of God, according to Luther, involves the conviction that sin is not forgiven gratuitously, without satisfaction of justice. There is no room for the exercise of mercy and grace toward us, or within us, until justice has been perfectly satisfied. 'In order that I may escape the wrath of God and obtain grace and forgiveness, *the debt must be worked off by some one*, for God can not be gracious and forgive sin and punishment, unless payment and satisfaction be made for it.' \* \* \* Humanity as sinful was subject to the wrath of God; it was guilty before God, under the power of the devil, exposed to the penalty of transgression, that is, to eternal death. But now Christ has entered into humanity in such way that He has borne for us the whole curse which sin has brought upon men. 'He has come into our stead, and has on our account suffered the law, sin, and death to fall upon Himself.' He pays for us, and stands security for our debt, so that we are quit. He is 'the sacrifice and payment of the sins of the whole world.' 'Christ took the place of our sinful nature as if He had been Himself guilty; the wrath of God which we had deserved He took upon Himself and exhausted; He was compelled to feel the wrath and judgment of God against sin in His own innocent heart, to *taste for us eternal death and damnation*; in short, He was compelled to suffer all that a damned sinner has deserved and must suffer eternally.

But all this He endured in order that the wrath of God might be appeased, and that we may be received into grace and obtain forgiveness.' \* \* \* Christ, accordingly, became a sacrifice for our guilt, He bore the wrath of God, took upon Himself the works of the law and its punishment, endured the assaults of the devil, and suffered death. And all this has its ground in the will of God who was unwilling to forgive until satisfaction was made to His justice. \* \* \* Luther's thought is that the law and its punishment ordained for sinful men have been abrogated through Christ by fulfilling the one and suffering the other. \* \* \* He who clings to Christ in faith is for His sake freed from the works as well as from the penalties of the law."

Of Calvin's doctrine, which does not differ essentially from Luther's, Prof. Seeberg, pp. 389-90, gives the following account: "As priest Christ acquires for us the divine grace by making satisfaction for us through His sacrifice, and appeasing the wrath of the Father. 'He poured out His own blood as the price of our redemption, in order that God's rage kindled against us might be extinguished, and our iniquity purged away.' The obedience of Christ by which this was accomplished extended through His whole life. In consequence of this obedience He became a *victima satisfactoria* and the *damnatio* due to our sins was visited upon Him. 'It was requisite that He should feel the severity of the divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God and satisfy His justice. Hence it was necessary for Him to contend with the powers of hell and the horrors of eternal death.' " It is to this suffering of the "horror of eternal death," especially on the cross, that Calvin, as is well known, referred the article of the Creed concerning the descent into Hades.

To the above account of Calvin's doctrine by Seeberg we add a few sentences directly from the *Institutes* (II., XVI., X.): "Christ was made a substitute and surety for transgressors, and even treated as a criminal Himself, to sustain all the punishments which would have been inflicted on them; only with this exception that 'it was not possible that He should be holden of the pains of death.' Therefore it is no wonder if He be said to have

descended into hell (*ad inferos*), since He suffered that death which the wrath of God inflicts on transgressors. \* \* \* For the relation of those sufferings of Christ, which were visible to men, is very properly followed by that invisible and incomprehensible vengeance which He suffered from the hand of God; in order to assure us that not only the body of Christ was given as the price of our redemption, but that there was another greater and more excellent ransom, since He suffered in His soul the dreadful torments of a person damned and lost (*damnati ac perditionis hominis*)."

Such quotations could be indefinitely multiplied from the writings of the Reformers and from the symbolical books of the Reformation age. The theory which underlies these conceptions is not Anselm's theory of satisfaction. That theory was based upon the principle, *aut satisfactio aut poena*. Satisfaction is something different from punishment. It consists in rendering to God something of value that will satisfy His wounded honor, though it be not punishment nor the equivalent of punishment. An offended person may consider his honor satisfied by something that is far less than an equivalent of the offense. In the theory of the Reformers satisfaction has become identical with punishment. Christ is supposed to have suffered a sum of punishment equal to that which all men would have been condemned to suffer eternally in the absence of a redeemer. Thus He has satisfied God's justice. Anselm regarded the satisfaction as having to do with the *honor* of God; the Reformers view it as having to do with His *justice*, which formed an absolute barrier to the exercise of mercy. Anselm's theory rests upon the idea of *private right*, and the satisfaction is supposed to be offered to Him as to a private person; the Reformers' theory rests upon the idea of *public right*, and the satisfaction is supposed to consist in this that Christ, as our substitute, has suffered the penalty which we as sinners had deserved to suffer, and has thus fulfilled for us the idea of justice. In later times the question arose how God could justly condemn impenitent and unbelieving sinners, since the punishment of their sins has already been borne and justice satisfied by the suffering of Christ; and the theory of a

*limited atonement* was invented in order to escape the difficulty. Christ, it was said, has not satisfied for the sins of all men, but only for those of the elect who will of necessity be saved. John Owen puts the following dilemma to those who believed in a universal atonement: "God imposed His wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men, or all the sins of some men, or some sins of all men. If the last, some sins of all men, then have all men some sins to answer for, and so shall no man be saved. \* \* \* If the second, that is it which we affirm. \* \* \* If the first, why then are not all men freed from the punishment of all their sins?" That is logically consistent. God can not in justice punish the same sins twice; and if all the sins of all men have already been punished in Christ, why will not all men be saved, and how can penitence be demanded as a condition of salvation?

We make no criticism now upon these theories. We ask our readers simply to study and ponder them carefully, and to remember that their authors were men like ourselves, struggling for light on a great subject in regard to which we can only see as through a glass darkly. Such study, we think, will tend to calm the minds of many who have looked with apprehension upon modern discussions of the atonement. They will see that there is a difference between accepting the *fact* of the atonement and accepting the *theories* which men have advanced in regard to it. They will see also that something is gained when theories which contradict the moral character of God are set aside, although no new theories may be proposed in their stead. And, finally, they will come to feel that the discussions now going forward are not only proper, but imperatively demanded by the intellectual and moral conditions of this age. Could the theory of Anselm or of Luther now be preached to the churches?

---

#### ROTHE'S THEORY OF THE CHURCH.

Richard Rothe was a theologian of the first magnitude, ranking with Schleiermacher as one of the most original thinkers of

the present century; and his theological views must, therefore, always command respectful consideration. These views have been brought to the attention of the present generation by the celebration, in Germany, on the 28th of January, 1899, of the one hundredth anniversary of his birth, and by the literature which this celebration has served to create. We have been accustomed to look upon Rothe mainly as a speculative theologian. Those who have known him merely from his *Theologische Ethik* and from his *Dogmatik* can scarcely conceive of him in any other capacity. But we have before us now a *brochure* of over one hundred pages, written by Dr. Heinrich Bassermann, professor of the Practical Theological Seminary of Heidelberg, the object of which is to represent him particularly as a *practical* theologian. And there is good reason for this representation; for not only was Rothe the founder and first director of this Practical Theological Seminary at Heidelberg, but he also during his life time held various responsible positions in church and state which required practical insight and activity of no mean order. Besides, as Dr. Bassermann claims, his whole theological system has an intensely practical tendency and aim. His doctrinal views, for instance, are for the most part better-adapted to the real needs of the present age, and can more easily *be preached*, than those of many a later theological work of far less speculative and philosophical depth.

Practical theology may be defined as the science of the vital functions of the church, by means of which she preserves, extends and perfects her existence. It will follow, therefore, that any system of practical theology, as well as the exercise of practical theological functions, must ever be determined by the fundamental conception of the nature and character of the church. What men think of the church and of her place and design in the economy of Christianity will to a large extent determine the manner in which they will exercise ecclesiastical functions. The Roman Catholic priest and the Protestant minister must differ as much in the discharge of their official duties in the pulpit, at the altar, or in the family, as they differ in their conception of the church.

We propose in this article briefly to present Rothe's theory of

the church, and to consider some of the practical implications and consequences which it may suggest. Our reason for doing so is, in the first place, a desire to contribute something in this way to the present celebration of the memory of Rothe; secondly, the intrinsic interest of the subject; and, finally, the conviction that there are elements in Rothe's theory which we of the present age may study with profit, both for the truth which it contains and for the perils which it seems to us to involve. Rothe's theory, as is well known, was recognized by himself as heterodox, that is, as not in harmony with the traditional dogmas concerning the church. He regarded the church not as the necessary and permanent form of Christianity, but only as a passing phenomenon in its historical development. His fundamental proposition is that, not the church, but the state is the most adequate representation of Christianity, and that the former is destined insensibly to dissolve into the latter. He came to this conclusion from the consideration that the church is merely a *religious* organization existing merely for the purpose of religious cultus, while Christianity is ethical as well as religious in its nature, and aims to penetrate and redeem every department of human life. Hence the church cannot be commensurate with Christianity. On the contrary, the state, which, according to Hegel, is the most complete moral community, is not only more comprehensive than the church, but also represents Christian elements which the church does not represent, while it is not wholly devoid of the element of religion. Hence as the ultimate result of Christian history the church will be swallowed up in the state; and the state will then take charge not merely of the interests of morality, but also of the interest of religion, art will be consecrated to its service, and the drama and the stage, having been redeemed from the curse of vanity now resting upon them, will become means of Christian cultus, as they were means of religious cultus in Greece. These conclusions, however startling they may be, can not easily be escaped, if the fundamental premise be admitted that the church is merely a religious organization without any ethical calling.



Yet, according to Rothe, though the church is merely a transitory appearance in history, her origin and existence are not merely the result of an error on the part of history; on the contrary she has had a mission in the world, and that mission is not yet ended. When Christianity came into the world, the world would not receive it, and the state took up an attitude of antagonism towards it. The organization of an independent Christian religious community was therefore an historical necessity. But by and by the antagonism ceased. The cross was elevated above the throne of the Cæsars. The leaven of Christianity was made, through the agency of the church itself, to permeate the state. But when this had occurred the state itself began to assume and exercise some of the functions of the church, for example, the care of the poor and the work of education. And this absorption by the state of functions originally discharged by the church has been advancing farther and farther until the latter has been compelled to restrict itself almost entirely to the function of religion. But now the moral communities embraced in the state, like the family, for example, involve religious elements and sanctions, too; and the church in fact insists that these religious elements shall be a recognized power in the administration of the state. But thus the two orders, the state and the church, cover the same territory without being identical, and the one must perpetually claim the things which belong to the other. This, however, is an anomalous relation that can not last always. The one order must at length be absorbed in the other. And there can be no question as to which order will be the prevailing one. There are evidences showing that the process of absorption of the church by the state is going on now. In fact it has been going on ever since the period of the Reformation, which was essentially a break with the old idea of the church, and not merely, as was supposed, an abolition of abuses. The Reformation was in reality the beginning of the dissolution of the church, because it was an emancipation of Christianity from the fetters of the church which had hitherto enchained it, and a free introduction of it into other departments of the social organism, especially that of the state.

Protestantism, in fact, has no church, but only Christian communities or congregations. The adoption of the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers was the death blow to the old idea of the church. Christianity is no longer confined to the church, and large masses of people who are not unchristian, have escaped from her communion, and are now living outside of her pale.

But, after all, says Rothe, the mission of the church is not yet ended, and will not be ended until the entire life of man shall have been permeated by the spirit of Christ, and until the state shall have entered into its ideal form of existence. That is as yet far from being the case; and until that condition shall have been reached the church will have a work to perform. That work will consist in *naturalizing* Christianity, or as Rothe prefers to say, *Christ*, more and more in the life of humanity. The church, then, has not its end in itself, but in the Christianization of the world. And it should not now conduct itself as if it were an end rather than a means, and as if its being were destined to be eternal rather than transitory. Whenever it does so it becomes false to its own idea. The church itself is not Christianity; churchmanship is not religion; and what the world now needs is not more church, but more of the spirit and life of Christ. The church, indeed, cannot yet be dispensed with, because the world, and especially the state, have not yet been fully Christianized; and because the spiritualizing and Christianizing energy can only come from the spirit of religion still embodied in the church. But in performing this work of Christianizing the world the church must not forget that the more she succeeds in her task, the closer she approaches her own dissolution and absorption in the state. And meanwhile she should so conduct her activity as to make this result in the end easy and natural. But this means that the church now must be *national in its organization* and must be closely allied with the state.

This is another of Rothe's fundamental conceptions. The church can only be true to her nature and destiny in the form of a national establishment or state church. There is accordingly

no catholic church in the old sense of the term. The Reformers felt the truth of this proposition so far as the actual empirical church is concerned. In the sense once claimed there never was any one catholic church. The Reformers proposed, however, to save the attribute of catholicity by the invention of the notion of an invisible church. If the visible church can not be said to be catholic, or universal, then the invisible at least may be declared to be such. But the idea of an invisible church, according to Rothe, is a contradiction in terms. A church is a body or society of Christian people; and this can not be anything if it is not visible. But in this sense there is not now, and there never was one universal church. That is a proposition which no unprejudiced historian would care to deny. There are only *churches*, provincial, national, denominational or confessional churches; and these are most true to their idea when they are most closely allied to the state, and articulate most thoroughly the religious character and aspiration of the nations to which they belong. The Reformers, therefore, made no mistake when in their reformatory activity they leaned heavily upon the state, and committed the control of the religious bodies which they created largely into the hands of the government. This was not merely the consequence of a stress of circumstances; but it was strictly in harmony with the idea of the church as an organization of the religious life of a civil community, which as such is destined gradually to lose its being in the state. The objection that such a dependence upon the state makes the church unfree in its performance of its proper task is not valid; for in point of fact "a free church within a free state" loses in inward freedom more than it gains in outward independence. A church governed by an independent hierarchy or by a body of theologians is inwardly less free than one that is governed by the state. This last proposition is one, certainly, which in view of the story of church history could not easily be refuted. American heresies show how much freedom there can be in a church governed by a body of theologians who regard their "systems" as sacrosanct as pagan communities regard their priesthoods.

But, now, as a suborganization of organized civil society, or of the state, the church is called to perform only religious functions. She exists, while she exists, simply for the sake of religious cultus. This, finally, is another of Rothe's fundamental conceptions. It is not the business of the church, at least in its Protestant and true form, to care for the moral and social interests of Christian society. These are in the hands of the state. The state, for instance, looks after the education, religious and moral, of its children. The state takes care of the poor and helpless within its borders. The state watches over the manners and morals of the people, protects them in the possession of their rights and punishes the lawless and disobedient. And the state regulates the institution of marriage and lays down and enforces the laws regarding family life. Into these and similar spheres it is not the business of the church to intrude. But, then, what remains for it to do? Simply to attend to the interests of religion and worship. Its sole function is the exercise of cultus. Cultus is an activity whose object is God. It consists in the cultivation of religious knowledge and in the performance of religious rites. To this strictly religious sphere the church is limited. And this is a truth which, since the Reformation at least, has come to be generally recognized. Catholic priests and more especially bishops, may still be disposed to meddle with civil and social questions, but not so Protestant ministers. The public opinion of Protestant society requires them to restrict their activity and their utterances to things which are purely religious. They must, as ministers, have no opinions on sociological, civil, economic and moral questions. On all matters of this kind the mouth of the church is required to be sealed; and she may speak only on things pertaining to "the other world." In Europe this law is enforced by the state and in America by public opinion. But all this is in line with the tendency towards the final absorption of the church in the state, when the latter shall have acquired a sufficiently decided religious as well as moral character.

Such in its main features is Rothe's theory of the church. It is sufficiently peculiar, certainly, to justify his own judgment in

regard to it as something heterodox. What shall we say of it? Shall we say that it is *rationalistic*, and wave it aside as a vagary inspired by the speculations of Hegel, and as therefore altogether unworthy of the serious attention of sane men? That was the manner once in which every thing that was German, either in philosophy or theology, was received by the theological public of this country. To bear any relation to the mind of Hegel or Schleiermacher was thought to be enough to convict any theory or conception of absurdity without further hearing. But this is so no longer. American theologians now sit at the feet of German teachers; and views which in the past would have been met with no patience at all, now receive respectful consideration. This will likely prove to be the case with some at least of the theological opinions of Rothe, as they are now again presented to the theological world. Rothe has hitherto not exercised as much influence over English and American thought as have some other writers of far less genius. This has been due largely to his uncouth and forbidding style. His works have not been translated. In fact they could not be translated. The only way in which they can be interpreted to the present generation is to reproduce them in an entirely new form. This will likely be done now, as the celebration of the author's birthday has given an impulse in this direction. And as thus reproduced, we may expect them to awaken sympathetic chords in the minds of many modern thinkers who are looking for relief from some of the hard points in traditional theology.

Thus Rothe's theory of the church will doubtless before long, become better known than it has been in the theological literature of this country. What reception shall we give it? It is too late now to turn away from it, as may have been the case once, with the simple murmur of *rationalism*. Moreover it contains elements, at least, from which we do not want to turn away. It involves a radical negation of the conception of the Church as a sacerdotal or hierarchical institution furnished with miraculous powers which may be operated by certain magical performances. That is the Roman Catholic theory of the church; and it has

ever been one of the weaknesses of Protestantism, that, in one way or another, it has shown a tendency to relapse into the old Romish view. Instead of consistently regarding the church as a free spiritual and moral communion organized and perpetuated by the spirit of Christ who is equally present in each and every member of it, there has been a constant tendency to regard it either as a reservoir of supernatural grace to be dispensed by means of physical operations, or as a corporation clothed with the powers of heaven for the exercise of discipline and for the promulgation and enforcement of dogmas. With all such notions Rothe's theory involves a total break; and that is well. Whether, however, it does not go too far in this direction, and ignore a great Christian reality, of the idea of which the Roman theory is a monstrous perversion, is another question, to which we shall come presently. We must agree with Rothe, however, that the Church is not identical with Christianity. Ecclesiasticism and religion are two different things. The church, moreover, exists for the sake of the religion, not the religion for the sake of the church. And when religious and moral needs require it, the organization and activity of the church may be changed in order to meet the existing need. "Only a consistent Catholicism, or a petrified Lutheranism," says Bassermann truly, "could now adhere to the imagination that the institution of a priesthood or of a clerical office with exclusive power to dispense the means of grace, could trace its origin directly back to Christ. We have gradually become disaccustomed to the imagination that Christ and His apostles were essentially a set of *parsons*, who were deeply concerned in matters of ritual, and whose main object was the foundation of an ecclesiastical establishment." In the sense here implied, we are bound to agree with Rothe and with his modern interpreter, that the church is not a divine institution, but a historical production subject to the universal laws of historical development.

The church, it may be said, is not an institution, but an organism. It is not a thing that has been made, but a thing that has grown. But as such it must be a spiritual and moral reality, an actual existence, having a life and laws of development which are



its own. Does Rothe's theory do justice to this idea? We do not believe that it does. It has only *churches*; and these are merely temporary organizations of the religious life of Christian societies, and bound in course of time to pass away. The church as one and universal is for it a mere abstraction. This, of course, is contrary to the teaching of the most primitive Christian creed, which makes the church an object of faith. But is it not contrary also to the teaching of the New Testament? It is true, in the New Testament the word *church* occurs most frequently in a singular, local or provincial sense. But it occurs also in a universal or collective sense. When Christ, in a passage whose genuineness is not disputed, says, "Upon this rock I will build my church," there is implied something more than that the church is merely an accidental product of the religious life of the nations. It is *one*, and it has Christ for its builder. We, of course, agree with those who hold that this building is not to be conceived in a mechanical way, according to the dream of those who maintain that Christ spent the time between His resurrection and ascension mainly in talking with His disciples about the institution of bishops and the polity and government of the church. Christ's way of building the church is inward, moral, spiritual and organic; but the result is a *spiritual reality*, whose existence does not depend upon the will of man. The same view is contained in the New Testament Epistles. St. Paul's favorite figure is that of a body—the body of Christ. Of course, that is a metaphor, and needs explanation. But it is not difficult to understand what the explanation must be. St. Paul looked upon the church, doubtless, as the society or communion of Christian believers, among whom Christ is always present, and who are by His Spirit and life united in one spiritual organism, through which He exercises His messianic functions among men. The church as thus viewed, is the agency through which Christ communicates Himself to the World for its salvation, and through which He appropriates the World to Himself as His kingdom.

But if we conceive of the church in this way we can, of course, not be satisfied with Rothe's representation of it as a mere pass-

ing phenomenon in the history of the Christian state, and as concerned only with strictly religious interests. If we remember how much of the teaching of Christ was of an ethical character, and how little indeed He had to say of religious ritual we can not believe for a moment that He can be truly represented by an institution that is purely religious. Nor can we believe that the church is an organism that is subordinate to the state, and destined at last to lose its being in the state; on the contrary we must suppose it to be coördinate with the state, and hold that both are designed to coöperate towards a result lying beyond either of them; and that result we suppose to be the *kingdom of God*. In the kingdom of God all moral communities are destined to have their end. The family, at least in the form in which we know it, will cease to exist in the kingdom of heaven. So will the state; and so also will the church. Instead of the church being meant to be absorbed in the state, both church and state are meant to be absorbed in the kingdom of heaven, and yet not in such way that the moral achievements of either shall ever be lost. Marriage will cease in the kingdom of heaven; but the love cultivated and the moral results accomplished through the marriage relation will never cease. And so the result accomplished through the church and the state will be perpetuated in the kingdom of God. It may be said that this conception differs from Rothe's only in form and not in substance. For Rothe has not the remotest idea that the church is in any immediate danger of losing her occupation and of being swallowed up by the state. It is only when the ideal of the state shall have come to be realized, and when every department of human society shall have come to be controlled by the spirit of Christ, that there will be nothing more for the church to do, and that she may be expected to lay down her office. Many generations of men will probably have to pass away, and milleniums of years will have to elapse, before the state shall have reached such an ideal condition as shall enable it properly to attend to the religious wants of the people. So that practically it may seem not to make much difference whether we say that the church will be swallowed up

in the state, or that it will be dissolved in the kingdom of heaven, for in either case its existence will only be temporal. Our conception of its ultimate destiny, however, will make a difference in our conception of its present relation to the state, as well as of its proper functions in the existing order of human life.

If we suppose with Rothe that the church is destined to vanish in the state, then we are bound also to assume with him that the proper relation now is a relation of dependence of the former upon the latter. The church then becomes merely an organ of the state, to be manipulated and governed by its officials. What that means church history has shown. We at least cannot favor the idea of any such union of church and state as that implies. Think but for a moment of our "practical politicians" administering the affairs of the church! We thoroughly believe in the American idea of a free church in a free state. But first of all, we believe in the reality of the church; we believe that the church is a spiritual organism capable of having an existence of its own, and that it ought therefore to be allowed to maintain its independence of the state, at least within certain limits. It is, of course, impossible to think of these two social organisms as absolutely separate from each other. This is a point which we discussed to some extent, in an article on *The Kingdom of God and the Church*, in the October number of this REVIEW. It is a point, however, that will bear consideration again. As in a physical organism there are subordinate organic systems, which are mutually related, and are yet relatively independent and have different functions to perform, so it is also with the organism of human society. The state is one system of this organism, whose controlling principle is the idea of *law* and *right*; and the church is another system within the same organism, whose controlling principle is the idea of *religion* and *morality*. Of these two principles the latter is the more profound and the more comprehensive; and the church, therefore, must be, if anything, more vitally related to the social organism than the state can be, although both must be indispensable; as the nervous system, for example, may be supposed to be more intimately related to the

life of the body than the digestive system, and yet neither could be wanting. Thus the church and the state are not identical, as they virtually are in the theory of Rothe; but neither are they separable, as they are so often supposed to be in this country. But of the true nature of their relation this country, as well as the old countries on the other side of the water, have doubtless something yet to learn. And, though we do not claim to be a prophet, yet we express our conviction here that, in the future, church and state will come much more closely together in this country than they have been in the past. This, we think, is evidently the expectation of the Roman Catholic communion, which we believe is laying its plans with reference to this result. It expects to be *the church* of this country some day; and the haunting of government offices, like the White House at Washington, by its prelates, has in it something ominous and perillous to the peace of the American people.

But as we cannot be satisfied with Rothe's theory of the relation of church and state, so neither can we be satisfied with his theory of the functions of the church. We must agree with him, of course, in holding that Christianity involves moral as well as religious interests, and can only rejoice that he has emphasized this truth. We must agree with him also in holding that the state has moral as well as religious functions to perform, and involves religious sanctions. But we cannot agree with him in supposing that the church must be restricted to the single function of religion, and that her work is done when she has taught her members what to believe and how to pray. We know that this view prevails in quarters in which Rothe's church theory would by no means be accepted; and it is curious to see many orthodox American theologians here meet on common ground with the heterodox German. But none the less we believe that this is a mistaken view. The function of the church is as broad as is the nature of Christianity. It is her duty to labor for the realization of the ethics of Christianity, in all spheres of human life, no less than for the realization of its faith and worship. She is to educate her members into good and honest citizens, into honest

lawyers, farmers, mechanics, merchants, manufacturers, no less than into orthodox believers and devout worshippers. No ethical interest can be foreign to her mind. She could not be indifferent to the slavery question half a century ago. She cannot be indifferent to the economic and social questions of to-day. If the blood of the poor is coined into money for selfish ends by the rich and powerful, the church cannot close her eyes and be silent, any more than the prophet could be silent when the lecherous king had murdered his neighbor and stolen that neighbor's wife. If the ballot box, and the jury box, and the judicial bench are debauched by the influence of money, the church cannot say that this is merely a secular business with which she has no concern. Her concern is with everything that is true, and good, and Christian, or the contrary.

And we believe that one reason why the church in these days has lost so much of her influence among men is that she has not been true to her great calling. She has done too often what Rothe's theory would require her to do; that is to say, she has confined herself to "teaching sound doctrine and exercising pure worship," without caring anything for men's manners, or morals, or worldly estate. And men in consequence have left her sanctuaries. Rothe thinks that this desertion of the church by the masses is in harmony with her idea as a transitory organization, which is bound to pass away as the state becomes more and more Christian. And Bassermann calls our attention to the fact that since Rothe's time this movement away from the church has gained very much in momentum, the number of the unchurched masses now being larger than ever and steadily increasing; and he regards this fact as a manifest token of the truth of Rothe's theory, that the state must increase while the church must decrease. But let us remember that Rothe supposed the dissolution of the church only to go hand in hand with the progressive Christianization of the state. Has then the Christianization of the state in modern times advanced so much as to account for this wide-spread feeling that the church is no longer necessary as a moral and religious power in the world? Are the governments

and politics of Christian nations and the morals of the men in whom they are embodied, of such character as would warrant such a theory? Alas, the question sounds in our ears like irony. When the doctrine has been unblushingly proclaimed that government policies have nothing to do with morality, nor politics with the Ten Commandments, and when the governments of so-called Christian nations have entered into infamous alliances for the oppression and destruction of weaker races, it is hardly a time to say that states present themselves in such an ideal light as to offer a substitute for the moral influence of the church.

No, men have not forsaken the church because the state and other secular institutions have been so desecularized and become so Christian, that for this reason the church is felt to be unnecessary; the defection has come to pass rather because the church herself has failed to exercise her moral power, and to accomplish the results which she should have accomplished. In the great struggle of the masses with the classes for larger liberties, and for better opportunities in the battle of life, which has been going on for almost a century, and which has become especially acute at the present time, the church has shown, or is believed to have shown, no particular zeal in favor of the oppressed and suffering masses. It is true, there have at all times been Christian prophets who, like the prophets of old, have espoused the cause of the weak and helpless; but the church in her large and organized capacity has too often been on the side of wealth, and power, and luxury. "I can scarcely remember an instance," says the third Earl of Shaftesbury, "in which a clergyman has been found to maintain the cause of laborers in the face of pewholders. \* \* \* So cowed were they (or in themselves so indifferent) by the overwhelming influence of the cotton lords. \* \* \* I had more aid from the medical than from the divine profession." That is a terrible indictment of the clergy of the Church of England as it was in the time of the first struggles for the improvement of the condition of English factory laborers. Of course all clergymen have not sinned in the same manner and degree. But there has been indifference enough to the sorrows of the poor to turn them away



from the doors of the church : and all this in utter forgetfulness of the opposite spirit and teaching of the Master. Dr. Fairbairn, in a work noticed elsewhere in this issue of the REVIEW, uses language which is quite as strong as that of Shaftsbury. He says : "The people feel that the Church, satisfied with what the State has done for *it*, has failed to stand by them in their dumb quest after a fuller justice and a fairer freedom ; and they feel that they but do as they have been done by, when they forsake the society which forsook them in their sorest need." It is especially of the Church of England that this is said. But it is true also of the Churches of this and other countries. Where has any ecclesiastical organization in recent years spoken out clearly and strongly in favor of the rights of man over against the rights of property ? The prevailing supposition is that, if rich men, out of their millions, will devote a few paltry hundreds or thousands to missions or to ecclesiastical institutions, the Churches will not inquire very closely into the manner in which they got their millions. Is it any wonder, then, that in these circumstances the work of missions is an uphill work ? Men will not come when they are called, because they do not trust the institution that is calling them. Do not the heathen know that the Churches view with complacency the work of their "Christian governments" ? What respect, for instance, could a German or an English missionary expect to enjoy in Armenia ? How can the Churches expect to gather in the masses so long as the latter see their powerful oppressors occupying front seats in the synagogues ? No, it is not the Christianization of the state, but the dechristianization of the church that has brought about the present churchless condition of so many. Let the church labor for the entire Christianization of the life of the people—for the Christianization of governments, of politics, of business, of industry—for the amelioration of the condition of the helpless and oppressed masses, and her sanctuaries, instead of being forsaken in consequence, as Rothe's theory would require, will be filled again to overflowing with devout and grateful worshippers.

## THE LESSON OF A NOTABLE CRIME.

One of the most notable crimes in the history of this country was committed in the city of Lancaster during the past year. It was the counterfeiting case of Jacobs, Kendig and Company, cigar manufacturers, of which the whole country has heard. These men planned and partly executed a scheme for the making of counterfeit money and revenue stamps to the amount of many millions of dollars. So well were their counterfeit bills and stamps executed, that they almost defied detection by the most skilled experts. But the most notable feature of the case was the boldness and confidence with which the crime was executed, and the extent of its ramifications; for not only had they drawn into their scheme a number of their employes, but at least one revenue officer of Lancaster, one ex-district attorney of Philadelphia, another lawyer of high standing in the same city and several skillful engravers. And they expected to draw into their enterprise men standing high in the detective service and in the treasury department of the government, and thus to make their undertaking altogether a safe as well as a profitable one.

The story of this famous crime reads like a romance; and the usual judgment is that these men must have been fools, for no sane men could expect to engage in such a crime and remain undetected. They should have expected that sooner or later they would be caught. The fact, however, is that that is just what they did expect; and that is the strange thing about the case. They expected to be caught some time. But they expected to be able to engage in their interest enough officials of the government to be able to smile at detection. They actually did corrupt an officer of the custom house; and they seem to have believed that they had nibbling at their bait several officers of the secret service; whether with or without reason, of course, we do not know. But one thing is sure, and that is that these men had no very high estimate of the honesty and fidelity of government officials. They believed that all such officials had their price. Treasury officials, revenue collectors, district attorneys, judges of courts, and even jurymen, all these they believed to be purchasable,

if a sufficiently high price were offered. And they had planned their enterprise on such a scale, and the prospective profits were so large, that they would need to hesitate at no price.

How shall we explain this confidence in the corruptibility of government officers? Shall we suppose that their daily contact with such officers, in their business as manufacturers of cigars, led them to form such a low opinion of their honesty? We should hardly be justified, we think, in making such an assumption; although it is true that the conduct of government officials is often such as must lead plain people to doubt at least their reasonableness, if not their honesty; as, for instance, when in this very case the government confiscated the goods honestly purchased and paid for by upright dealers from these crooked manufacturers. But Jacobs and Kendig were not plain men; and it would perhaps be too much to suppose that they were influenced by such circumstances. And yet the crime of these men can not be explained entirely apart from the environment in which they were educated and under the influence of which they acted. Must we not, then, admit that the corruption which prevails to a very large extent in official life, must be in some measure held responsible for the strange criminal infatuation of the men connected with this remarkable case? Were bribery and corruption in government offices never heard of, is it likely that Jacobs and Kendig would have conceived so bold a scheme? They knew men in public life. They knew also how a great many men get into public life. They knew that offices are not seldom purchased and paid for with money. But what may be expected of men who get into office in this way? May not men who buy their way into office, or know that somebody else is buying it for them, naturally be supposed to be open to bribery and corruption? The judge who buys his seat upon the bench of the district or county court by the bribery of voters at the primary election, could hardly be expected to be an incorruptible judge. And the man who gets a cabinet office because he raised a large amount of money in order to carry an election, could hardly be expected to be an immaculate officer.

And here, then, we rearch the lesson of this remarkable crime in this staid old city of Lancaster. These conspirators and bribers are men who know something of the ways of official life. They know something of the ways in which men get into office. They know too that men occupying high official positions, without extravagantly high salaries, in many cases soon get enormously rich. And, of course, they judged that all men in official places are corruptible, and can be bribed if the stake is high enough. Here they made a mistake. There are men in places of public trust whom no amount of money would buy. Doubtless the majority are of this kind. And if Jacobs and Kendig, and their confreres, had not been bad men, they would have taken this view of the case. It was their own bad imagination which represented all servants of the government as corruptible men. But, after all, their imagination was stirred by what they daily saw taking place in the political and official world; and the conduct of that world is at least in part responsible for their crime. And who is responsible for the character of this political and official world? Evidently it is the sovereign citizen with the ballot in his hand. And here is where the case of Jacobs and Kendig ought to come home to all of us. Such crimes will occur until the atmosphere of private and official life is much purer than it is at present. So long as criminals who manage to keep out of state prison only by pleading the law of limitation, fill high offices in the government by votes of their Christian fellow-citizens, so long there will be men like Jacobs and Kendig. That is the lesson which this notable crime plainly teaches. It is the result of "practical politics," and until we rid ourselves of such politics, we shall have such sensations as that which last summer excited not only the city and county of Lancaster, but the whole country. And such occurrences do very much to throw doubt upon the stability of our institutions, by showing the depth of corruption lying under the foundations of society.

## IX.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

**CATHOLICISM: ROMAN AND ANGLICAN.** By A. M. Fairbairn, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. Pages, xxiii + 481. Price, \$2.00. Charles Scribner's Sons, 153 Fifth Avenue, New York. 1899.

Dr. Fairbairn is known to the theological public in England and America by his able and interesting work on "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology." By means of that work, and by means of other publications, he has won for himself a high place in theological literature; and anything that comes from his pen may be regarded as possessing merits of a high order, and as being worthy of most serious and thoughtful attention.

The present volume consists of a series of essays written at various times during the past ten or twelve years. The older papers in the collection have, however, been carefully revised, so that, as the author tells us in the preface, they furnish a correct representation of his mind at the present time. It is not thought which the author himself has outlived, and which he is selling now only for the money that is in it, that we have in this volume, but thought, which has engaged his mind for years, and which may now be regarded as the ripest product of his thinking. The book is, therefore, in every sense a new and a fresh book. And it is a book that is coherent, unitary, and progressive in the matter which it presents, notwithstanding the fact that that matter was produced at different times and in different circumstances. Its various articles all relate to one subject, which they present under various aspects and in various historical relations.

By the title, *Catholicism: Roman and Anglican*, the author means the Catholic revival which took place in England during the second and third quarters of the present century; resulting in a large secession from the Church of England and in the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, on the one hand, and in such an infusion of Catholic leaven into the Church of England, on the other, as has served gradually to separate that communion from the fellowship and sympathy of the Protestant Churches, and to assimilate it more and more to the Church of Rome, which yet persistently refuses to recognize it as "a true part of the Catholic Church." That movement was a phenomenon in the religious history of England which is worthy of the thoughtful study of all earnest theologians. And these pages of Dr. Fairbairn's afford valuable help to such study. For the occasion of that movement, the men engaged in it, and the principles by which they were actuated, are here discussed with an intelligence, a candor and an ability that can not fail to interest and enlighten the careful and earnest reader, who will rise from the

perusal of this book with larger views of the church question than he possessed before.

Dr. Fairbairn himself is a Congregationalist, but he sympathizes with that Christological and historical tendency in theology, which has for a long time prevailed in Germany, and which has now come to be prevalent also in this country in the form of what is commonly called the "new theology." He is not unchurchly in the sense in which so many of the older Congregationalist divines were unchurchly, and we suppose he would not approve of the proposition that "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants"; but he is very far, of course, also from that exaggerated notion of the Church which regards it as a sacrosanct body, "the continuous incarnation of the Son of God," mediated by the miracle of episcopal ordination. His own idea of the Church may be gathered from the first article of the volume before us, entitled "The Churches and the Ideal of Religion." Let no one take offence at the use of the term *Churches*, as if the author had no conception of the Church as one. He understands the idea of its unity, in the true sense, very well; but what he has to do with is the Church in its present empirical form, in which it comes before us in a number of formally independent bodies. What is the relation of these bodies to religion? Dr. Fairbairn answers: "Churches are, that religion may be realized. \* \* \* The churches are the means, but religion is the end; and if they, instead of being well content to be and to be held means, good in the degree of their fitness and efficiency, regard and give themselves out as ends, then they become simply the most irreligious of institutions, mischievous exactly in proportion of their strength. Religion is too rich and varied a thing to be capable of incorporation in any one church, or even in all the churches; and the church that claims to be able to embody it, whether for a people or for humanity, simply shows the poverty and impotence of its own religion ideal," pp. 1, 2.

We here furnish a few more quotations, without much regard to the connection in which they appear: "The function or end of the religious man is to be a minister or vehicle of the divine purposes: and so the function or office of religion is to qualify man for this work. To perform it he must have a nature more or less open to God, and stand, so to speak, in a relation of reciprocity with Him. The worst atheism is that which reduces all God's action in the world to interference or miracle. The supernaturalism which limits His grace and truth to a single church, however universal it may claim to be, profanely expels Him from nature and humanity. There is a sense in which the highest ecclesiasticism is the worst theism; it lives largely by its denial or limitation of Deity," p. 18. "The man who has the strength of fanaticism in things sacerdotal is by this very fact made a stranger to the spirit and inspiration of true religion," p. 24. This last quotation is



from a section entitled *The Ideal of Religion Embodied in Jesus Christ*. And whoever will compare the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, "the supreme religious personality of the race," as the author here does, with the pretensions of any sacerdotal order, whether that of Rome or of England, will feel that the words just quoted are not one whit too strong. The priest, who sincerely regards himself as a sacrosanct being, and believes that there is some supernatural virtue in the "silk and lawn" in which he is arrayed, cannot understand Christ, nor can he understand the spiritual life of one of His humblest followers. And such spiritual blindness was displayed abundantly in the history of the Catholic movement in England.

This movement, as Dr. Fairbairn shows in this volume, must be viewed both in relation to the religious life and theological thought in England, and in relation to the development of theological thought outside of England. There was in the early part of the present century a very marked revival of conservative Catholic thought in Continental Europe. This can be studied nowhere to better advantage than in France. There, after the violent suppression of Protestantism, the Catholic Church failed utterly in getting the Christian idea into the life of the people, and the revolution, with its excesses, was the consequence. After the stormy period of the revolution was well past, there was a revival, not of true religion, but of *Catholicism*, which produced the most extreme views in regard to the impotence of human reason and the authority of the Catholic Church. This revival, led by De Maistre and others in France, had its echoes in England, and Manning, Pusey, Keble, Froude, and Newman were its most distinguished organs. Philosophical scepticism here, as in France, was its presupposition. In things spiritual the human reason cannot be trusted, therefore there is need of an outward infallible authority, such as the Roman Catholic Church claims to be. Such authority the leaders of the movement, in their Tractarian period, claimed to possess in the Anglican Church, in consequence of the historic episcopate, as the "Anglo Catholics" now claim; but the old Tractarians by and by saw that the claim was futile, and they went over into the camp of Rome, where there is reason to believe that they were not always the happiest men in the world. But for a detailed account of this movement the reader must consult the pages of Dr. Fairbairn in the volume before us; where he will find a fair and critical view of the characters and motives of the men engaged in it.

Dr. Fairbairn's judgment of these men, and of their cause, as well as of those large numbers who have remained in the Anglican Church, and have revolutionized its spirit, we believe, is sound and just. He gives them credit for honesty and sincerity of purpose, with some exceptions, however, and appreciates their ability and learning. He also recognizes the fact that in some

respects they have done good service to the cause of religion. But they were after all not transcendently great and good men. Manning was not open and sincere. Newman was a sophist who not seldom imposed upon himself. Pusey was learned, but not heroic. They all fought with very carnal weapons; and they are not men whom one can love and trust. Newman has exercised influence by means of his logical skill and his perfect mastery of the English language; but it is not an influence that is spiritual and abiding.

But we must bring this notice to an end. We hope our readers will study the book for themselves; and we are sure that they will find it instructive and strengthening to their Protestant faith. If there are still any whose souls are perturbed with doubts on the church question, they ought to find in these pages peace of mind and rest. And if the book should fall into the hands of any who have been charmed by the brilliant sophistry of a Newman, and influenced to ape after his Catholic manners at a distance more or less remote, it is to be hoped that the perusal of it will serve to bring them back into a state of perfect mental sanity.

BEACON LIGHTS: *A Series of Short Sermons.* By Joseph A. Seiss, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D. Pages, 539. Board of Publication of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. No. 1522 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1900.

The author of this volume has long been known as an able and genial writer on various subjects in theology, especially such as are of an homiletical and practical character. The sermons which are here collected will sustain the reputation which he has already made. He is a preacher and theologian of the Lutheran Church, and stands upon the platform of the doctrinal confessions of that Church as interpreted by the General Council. This theological position is implied in the sermons here published. They are Lutheran and orthodox; but they are not for that reason *sectarian*, and they could be preached to any congregation of orthodox Christians. The author defines his own theological position in the first two sentences of the preface. "It is a vital truth," he says, "never to be overlooked nor allowed to sink out of practical regard, that the supernatural elements of our holy Christianity, and not its mere ethical teachings, constitute its characteristic life and only saving power. The true dignity, inspiration and effectiveness of the pulpit, as well as the living perpetuity of the Church, depend upon the clearness, emphasis and supreme prominence given to these elements." To this principle the author is always true; and the reader of these sermons will discover in them no influence of any modern criticism or science. The Bible is taken as it is, and used for the instruction and edification of Christian people; which, in our opinion, is in general the correct rule for preachers to follow. In following this rule, however, we

think Dr. Seiss sometimes adopts interpretations of Scripture which are fanciful and untenable. For instance, in the last sermon in the volume he explains the words of Christ, Mark 9: 1, "There be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power," as referring to His transfiguration in presence of the three chosen disciples. That transfiguration was the coming of the kingdom which those disciples were permitted to see during their life time. That would be an easy way of overcoming an exegetical difficulty, if one could have confidence in its legitimacy; which we confess we have not, nor do we think that many Biblical scholars can be found who would be willing to adopt it.

Defects of this kind, however, do not detract seriously from the value of this volume of sermons. It is one great merit of these sermons that they are *edifying* and *devotional*. They are not theological discussions of abstruse questions in which common Christians can have no interest. They are meant for common Christians, and they are adapted to the *hearts* of common Christians. In this respect they are models of sermons. And they are models of sermons also in respect of length. They are, as we are told in the title of the book, *short sermons*. They would not exceed in delivery more than twenty or thirty minutes, and some of them could be delivered in less time than that. This will commend them, even in their printed form, to the favor of persons who have not the time or patience to read long and difficult treatises.

But a chief peculiarity of these sermons, finally, is that they are adapted to the *Church year*. For every Sunday and every festival day in the Christian year there is a sermon. The sermons are not always based upon texts taken from the lessons of the day. They are often taken from other portions of Scripture, but the sermons are always in harmony with the spirit of the day as expressed in lections and collects. There is a prejudice against following the order of the Church year in the ministration of the pulpit, which has its ground in the supposition that in this case sermons must always be based upon the pericopes, and that for this reason they must at last become uninteresting and monotonous. How can a man year after year preach on the same text, and yet give his sermons the quality of variety and freshness? That is a question that is often asked with an air of triumph, as if the answer were a decisive refutation of the claims of the Church year. But Dr. Seiss' practice as shown in this volume teaches us how a man can follow the order of the church year without always preaching upon the pericopes. If a man has entered thoroughly into the spirit of the Church year, he will be able for any day to find in the Scriptures a great variety of texts and themes on which he may preach instructive and profitable sermons. If anybody doubts this let him read these sermons by Dr. Seiss. And if any

preacher who wants to follow the order of the church year, finds himself often in perplexity as to what he shall preach on any particular Sunday, let him also turn to these sermons, and he will usually find help. The volume, finally, may be recommended for devotional reading also to the laity. The reading of one of these sermons every Sunday would be profitable to church members. And for this purpose it can be recommended to Reformed as well as to Lutheran people.

THE DAWN OF A NEW ERA, AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Dr. Paul Carus. Pp. 50. Price, 15 cts. The Open Court Publishing Company. Chicago, Ill.

This pamphlet belongs to the *Religion of Science Series* which is published bi-monthly at the price of \$1.50 a year. The "other essays" included in this issue are "The New Orthodoxy," and "Professor Romanes on Religion." Dr. Carus has been something of an iconoclast among traditional religious opinions. His writings are always interesting, and worthy of attention, but, as in St. Paul's, there "are some things in them that are hard to be understood." He is an apostle of the religion of science, and we have no doubt that he has a mission to fulfill in the religious thinking of our time. With many of his utterances we can heartily agree. We quote a few of them from the present publication: "Under the conditions (of the present time) it is but natural that our religious beliefs, too, will have to be revised and restated. They must be purified in the furnace critique, and I trust that thereby they will not lose in religious significance." \* \* \* "Agnosticism will not save us, and blind faith has no warrant, but we must broaden both our science and our religion until our religion becomes scientific, and our science religious." We believe that that is well said, and that no theologian of the present day ought to object to it. The following sentences are almost surprising in their agreement with an old and well known Christian doctrine: "By rendering the Logos illogical, you not only make science impossible, but also change Religion into the superstition of mere traditionalism. The acceptance or rejection of science means the parting path between genuine Religion and superstition." \* \* \* "Thus science is the embodiment of the immutable world-order of the Logos that was in the beginning, of God in His revelation, and truly, 'this is the stone which was set at naught by the builders which is become the head of the corner.'" That we can accept, but not so the following: "In the same way that God is not an individual being, that He is not a huge ego or person like ourselves, but a superpersonal omnipresence, so he is neither moral nor good nor ethical; for God is the standard of goodness; He is the norm, conformity to which is the condition of ethics; He is the ultimate authority for all moral conduct." With the last three propositions we fully agree; but we do not see how they harmonize with the proposition immediately pre-

ceeding, nor with the one which here follows: "He is neither moral nor immoral, but unmoral, or let us say 'supramoral.'" To our mind the following statements are truer, but in radical conflict with the foregoing: "Our intellect is but the reflexion of God's nature in our soul. Man's reason is the light of His life; it is a product of that world-logos which science traces in all natural laws, and it is the seal of man's divinity which constitutes his similarity to God." If man's intellect is the reflexion of God's nature, man's reason the light of God's life, how then can God be impersonal or immoral? We prefer to believe with Lotze, that God is personal and moral in a far more perfect sense than that in which this can be said of man. But we commend Dr. Carus' essays to our readers as well worthy of their attention; and we express the hope that he will keep on speculating until he shall get around to the *essential*, though it may not be the *orthodox*, doctrines of the Christian faith. We think we see in these essays evidences of a manifest tendency in that direction.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Charles W. Rishell, A.M., Ph.D., Professor of Historical Theology in Boston University School of Theology. Pp. xxviii + 616. Price, \$3.50. Eaton & Mains, New York, and Curtis & Jennings, Cincinnati. 1899.

This work forms the ninth volume of the "Library of Biblical and Theological Literature," in course of publication under the general editorship of Drs. George R. Crooks and John F. Hurst. It may, therefore, be expected to breathe the theological atmosphere of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It moves, however, in a plane of thought and deals with a series of subjects which are not denominational, and is as valuable for the theologian of one denomination as for those of another. Its doctrinal spirit, like that of other volumes of the series, we are told is in harmony with the accepted standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but the aim has been to make it acceptable to Christians of all Evangelical Churches. And we believe that that aim has been fully realized.

The book is not merely a treatise on apologetics. Apologetics has for its aim the removal of difficulties and the preparation of the mind for faith. Nor is it merely a work on Christian evidences. Such a work would show that the Christian position is intellectually and morally obligatory. It is both of these, and it more: it is a presentation of Christian truth in such form and to such an extent as to demonstrate its inner rationality and necessity. The best evidence of the system of Christian truth is ever the presentation of that system itself. Christian truth when fairly presented to an honest mind will authenticate itself as true, where no amount of "advocacy," or of special pleading, might amount to anything. From this point of view much of the material contained in this volume is justified, which could hardly be the case

from the mere standpoint of an apology. For instance, a good deal of space is devoted to criticism of defective doctrinal views, like deism in theology, and monism in psychology. At first view this might seem to transcend the limits of such a work. If it is remembered, however, that the truth is its own best evidence, such discussion and criticism of defective theories cannot be considered out of place in a work on "*The Foundations of Christian Faith.*"

In the introduction the author discusses the conceptions of *knowledge, belief, faith, and unbelief*. Knowledge, we are told, is of that which is real, and comes by *intuition*, by *demonstration*, by *revelation*, by *experience*, and by *combinations* of the preceding methods. *Belief* is opinion with reference to matters which lie more or less beyond the possibility of true knowledge. *Faith* is related to belief, but differs from it by emphasizing more the emotional elements of our being. "We believe in a proposition; we have faith in a person." Unbelief is more than doubt; it is rejection of the truth.

After the introduction the author arranges his material in eight *divisions*, with a great many subdivisions and chapters. The first division, in four sections, containing altogether twenty-six chapters, treats of the "Relations of Philosophy and Christianity." The first section is devoted to *atheism*; and here we have a discussion of the atheism of the physical senses, of the materialistic denial of the soul, of the materialistic denial of God, and of the imperfections of the world and of intelligence in creation. The subjects of sections two, three and four respectively are agnosticism, pantheism, and deism. The general subject of the second *division* is "Scientists and Theologians in Conflict." The third *division* treats of "Christianity and Modern Historical Science." Under this head the opposition to miracles is considered. Here Hume's theory of evidence is discussed. On the miracle in general, which the author comes to consider more than once, under various points of view, a distinction is made between the miraculous and the supernatural, which is of considerable importance, and it is contended that the miracle is never a violation of the laws of nature. The miracle may be supposed to result from a special manipulation or adjustment of the laws of nature, or from the bringing in of the laws of a higher nature holding in suspension those of a lower nature, as chemistry holds in suspension the laws of mechanical nature; but a violation of the laws of nature, or a bringing to pass results in contravention of the laws of nature, cannot be admitted. A criticism of the New Testament records also forms a section of this division.

*Division* four treats of "The Struggle of Christianity with Antichristian Ethics." "Christianity and Opposing Religious Theories" forms the subject of the fifth *division*. Here are considered the various substitutes which have been proposed for



Christianity, like Positivism, Ethical Culture, Theosophy, and Christian Science. "The Doctrine Concerning Man" is discussed in the sixth *division*. This embraces the spiritual nature of the soul, the personality of man, immortality, and the origin of human sin. On this subject the author joins issue with the evolution theory, especially as represented by Mr. John Fiske. It should be remarked, however, that the author here walks with considerable uncertainty. When the argument of leading thinkers is all on one side, and when on the other side are only the exigencies of a preconceived theory, it is not easy to have confidence in one's conclusions. In our view it is not necessary to deny the doctrine of evolution in order to maintain the reality of sin. Man was made a natural being first, and then it was not a sin for him to be natural; but when the time came for him to be spiritual, and he persisted in remaining natural, then he became sinful. That at least is the manner of moral development now, and we do not think that it makes a man a whit less sinful, than he would be according to the old theory of a fall from a condition of perfect moral life into a state of total depravity.

The seventh *division* is devoted to "The Doctrine Concerning God." This treats of the proofs of the divine existence and personality. The last *division*, finally, treats of the general subject of "Revelation." The possibility of revelation, primitive revelation, natural revelation, Biblical revelation, limitations of Biblical revelation, and inspiration, are some of the subjects discussed in this *division*. On the subject of revelation it is insisted, and we think properly, that the purpose of revelation is not literary, historical or scientific, but religious. The object of revelation is God and His will in relation to man. The Biblical revelation, moreover, is progressive, and hence always imperfect. The Old Testament is affected with limitations, both doctrinal and moral, corresponding to the limited capacity of man; and we could not now resort to the Old Testament for a perfect revelation of God. Indeed, Christ alone can be for Christians the absolute standard of divine truth. Both the Old Testament and the New are *inspired*, but inspiration does not make the Scriptures infallible. The author gives no theory of inspiration. He only maintains that the Scriptures possess *something* which distinguishes them from other writings in a religious regard, and which makes them profitable for teaching, for instruction, for reproof, for correction in righteousness; and for the enjoyment of this benefit it is only necessary that we should consider them, as in the ordinary sense, credible witnesses. Christ is the chief source of revelation, and the Bible helps us to know Christ. In the last part of this work the author treats, among other matters, the sinlessness of Jesus, His pre-existence, His miracles, and his resurrection from the dead. A contrast of Christianity with other religions ends the volume.

The volume is a large one. The pages are four by seven inches in size, and they are closely printed in long primer type. That, of course, is evidence that the book is not intended for light reading. The minute treatment and the subdivision of subjects, which gives it something of an encyclopedic character, also fits it better for close study, than for rapid perusal. The complete index, moreover makes it convenient as a book of reference. The theologian may here find collected together what otherwise he might often have to look for through many volumes.

**VITAL SCIENCE.** Based upon Life's Great Law, the Analogue of Gravitation. Agnosticism Refuted. By Robert Walter, M.D. Pp. xix + 319. J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia. 1899.

The task which this book proposes to itself is a large one. It is nothing less than the establishment of a new theory of life, that shall embody a new theory of creation, a new theory of the constitution of nature, a new theory of the constitution of man, and a new proof of immortality, and all this is to issue in a solution of the problem of health, and even of the mysteries of religion. The author disputes the ordinary theory of evolution, as held by Herbert Spencer and others, which he holds is not *evolution* at all, but *involution*. "Evolution," he says in the preface, "is the doctrine of Moses and Jesus, of Paul and Luther. It is the most conspicuous, certain and common fact of every day existence. But Mr. Spencer is an Involutionist. \* \* \* He has no thought of *unfolding* realities. He is forever intent upon *infolding* them—intent upon involving all things in the circumstances of their environment." And yet Dr. Walter claims that Spencer and others have never understood the laws of environment. This ignorance is now, however, dispelled, and the laws are set forth in this volume, upon which rest the truths of the Christian religion, the doctrine of total abstinence in temperance, and the correct theory of the practice of medicine. These laws "give an overwhelming demonstration of the fallacies of medical as well as of social stimulation."

The author's fundamental theory is that life is a force or entity analogous to mechanical force, or gravitation, and chemical force, or affinity. He makes the familiar distinction between the *cause* and the *condition* of a thing. The cause of life is the vital force, and the condition of its "evolution" is the environment. But what is the cause of this cause? Whence does life come? The author answers from the "Great First Cause." And to that answer there can certainly be no objection. In fact it is an answer that is universally given. Only there may be difference of opinion as to the nature of that cause, and also as to the manner in which life is derived from it. The "laws of vital relation," already referred to, under which life is evolved, according to Dr. Walter, are four, namely, *the law of action, the law of power, the*

*law of effects, and the law of vital accommodation.* We copy the author's statement of these laws for the benefit of our readers. The first reads as follows: "Whenever action occurs in the living organism, as the result of extraneous influence, the action is to be ascribed to the living thing which has the power of action, and not to the dead." From this it follows that "the living organism acts upon extraneous matter, such as medicine, food, drink, etc., and not that the medicine, food, drink, act upon the organism." The second law reads as follows: "The power employed and consequently expended in any vital action is vital power—is power from within and not from without." The third law is stated thus: "The secondary effect of any act, habit, indulgence, or agency upon the human organism is the exactly contrary or opposite of the primary effect." This seems to be but another form of the law that action and reaction are equal and opposite. The unnatural excitement produced by an overdose of alcohol yields to unnatural depression. The fourth law is "the law of vital accommodation." This is said to be nature's balance-wheel. It is the self-adjustment of nature to the manner in which it is exercised and to its environment.

Whether the theory thus briefly indicated is sufficiently new and sufficiently true to justify the claims which are made in behalf of it, is a question which we will leave to the decision of our readers. It will be remembered, however, that it is put forward in the interest of a theory of health, or disease rather, and of a theory of medicine. Disease, like health, is a consequence of the action of the vital force. "And whether the result shall be disease or health depends upon whether the conditions are healthful or unhealthful, subject however to the controlling influence of Nature's balance wheel—the law of vital accommodation." That is a position which, we think, few will dispute, although many will say that it is nothing new. But, then, it is doubtless a thing that needs to be said often, and that cannot be said too plainly. Live according to the laws of health, and you will be likely to be healthy. That is sound advice, no matter what may become of the author's medical theory; which seems to be leaning to the tenets of homeopathy, to some extent at least. This is sound advice: "Health by living healthfully is the true idea. 'Cease to do evil and learn to do well' is science, philosophy, and religion all at the same time."

**ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES.** A Guide to the Study of the International Sunday-school Lessons, with Original and Selected Comments, Methods of Teaching, Illustrative Stories, Practical Applications, Notes on Eastern Life, Library References, Maps, Tables, Pictures, and Diagrams. 1900. By Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, and Robert Remington Doherty. Pp. 388. Price, \$1.25. Easton & Mains, New York. Curtis & Jennings, Cincinnati. 1899.

The title-page of this volume is sufficiently descriptive of its contents. It is especially intended for the use of Sunday-school

teachers in the preparation of their lessons, and contains the ordinary helps for that purpose. There are explanatory comments, pictures, cards, analyses of lessons, questions, seed thoughts, hints to teachers, in a word everything that a teacher who needs help of this kind, could desire. The explanatory comments are derived from various sources. Augustine, Bunyan, Bushnell, Adam Clarke, De Wette, Farrar, Godet, Lange, Luther, Melancthon, Schaff, Spurgeon, and many others are among the authorities referred to. The book is printed on clear white paper, is well bound, and altogether it is a delight to the eye. The pictures and maps add to its usefulness.

There are, however, some evidences of careless editing. For example, in the very first lesson, it is said "that our calendar is incorrect; and, counted properly from the birth of our Lord, the present year would be 1895 or 1896 instead of 1900." That must be rather puzzling to a Sunday-school scholar, when he is told at the same time that the birth of our Lord took place four or five years earlier than the commencement of the present era. On the subject of the Lord's genealogy it is said that Joseph was not the son, but the son-in-law of Jacob, although Matthew says that "Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary." This is hardly an honest treatment of Scripture, although it is adopted evidently in order to get over a difficulty. Should Sunday-school scholars be taught such doubtful expedients? On the change of the construction of the angelic hymn, in Luke 2: 4, adopted by the Revised Version, it is observed that this is "a change hardly to be preferred"; and then it is added that "the difference between the two readings in the Greek is very slight, a difference of only one letter, which however changes a *verb* from the nominative case to the genitive case." There we have both an inexcusable *slip*, and an erroneous criticism. There can be no question of the correctness of the Revised Version at this point; and to insist upon retaining the old version because *to us* it makes better sense, is the *subjectivism* for which the critics are sometimes blamed.